National Library
of Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Services des thèses canadiennes

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (r.86/06)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

POWER STRUCTURES AND MAJOR SPORTING EVENTS IN EDMONTON

by

Ⓒ MARK KOLEY

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS IN RECREATION

RECREATION AND LEISURE STUDIES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1984

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-37857-3

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR	MARK KOLEY
TITLE OF THESIS	POWER STRUCTURES AND MAJOR SPORTING EVENTS IN EDMONTON
DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED	MASTER OF ARTS IN RECREATION
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED	FALL, 1984

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(SIGNED) Mark Koley

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

341 Kildare Ave. East
Winnipeg Manitoba
Canada

DATED October 10 1984.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled POWER STRUCTURES AND MAJOR SPORTING EVENTS IN EDMONTON submitted by MARK KOLEY in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS IN RECREATION.

Leslie Bella

Supervisor

Thomas L. Burton

Date October 12th 1984

ABSTRACT

Although a variety of studies have been developed to determine how power in a community is structured, there is little agreement concerning the conceptualization of power and its subsequent measurement. There are two main schools of thought about how power should be conceptualized and how it should be measured, one is based upon pluralist ideology and the other on elitist ideology. Each school has a different concept of reality. The pluralists see power as something that can be seen by many people (overt) and can be measured by identifying those people overtly involved in some important community decisions. Elitists will allow that power can be exercised in a covert manner, and may exist even when not actively exercised at all. People who are powerful may affect decisions through other people. Covert power is more difficult to measure, but may be discerned by interviewing people and gathering their perceptions and their nominations as to who they believe to be powerful.

Upon a review of the literature, it becomes evident that the method which is used to measure power predetermines the results. A particular method tends to measure only one aspect of power. In addition, the way in which power is conceptualized influences the choice of methods

with which it is measured. For example, if power is seen as overt involvement in the decision making process, then the method used to measure it will be based upon reconstructing some of the major decisions in a community and identifying those people who were involved. In such a case those involved would be identified as powerful. The covertly influential would tend not to be recognized.

In order to overcome the bias inherent in the various approaches, different methods and concepts of power were combined in this study. Overt and covert power were operationalized and measured in the following four ways:

1) Meeting one of five criteria of involvement according to written documentation. A form of decision analysis was used involving the reconstruction of events from documents and the identification of the individuals involved;
2) A person who was perceived by others to be powerful was considered powerful. Using a reputational analysis, people were identified as powerful depending upon the number of nominations they received;
3) A person was considered powerful depending upon how he or she affected the outcome of the event. Using a form of latent content analysis, interviews were examined to determine how people contributed to

the outcome of the event (whether it was in an overt or a covert manner); and

4) A person was considered powerful if he or she was nominated as being essential for bringing another major sporting event to Edmonton. A projected reputational approach was developed. Respondents were asked to identify those people who would be essential for bringing another major sport event.

These four methods were applied to two decisions to bring major sporting events to Edmonton (the Commonwealth Games in 1978 and the World University Games in 1983). The object was to determine if the same people were involved in obtaining both events. If there was a 40% overlap of people from each event, then an elite power structure was considered to exist.

Three of the methods: ((1) decisional analysis, (2) reputational and (4) projected reputational) failed to support the hypothesis, whereas (3) the latent content analysis of data support the hypothesis with a 41.3% overlap. Further results showed that each method tended to identify and emphasize a different aspect of power. In this study, the method(s) which emphasized overt power failed to support the hypothesis. The method which identified the covert aspect revealed a sufficient overlap which supported the hypothesis.

In the conclusion, it was stressed that both the covert and overt aspects of power should be measured. If both are not operationalized, the results will be biased. Both the reputational and the decisional methods should be combined to determine both (covert and overt) aspects of power.

In addition the results from the latent content analysis revealed that there was sufficient overlap between the two groups indicating that a persistent power structure was responsible for bringing major sporting events to Edmonton.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION 1
  Statement of Problem 1
  Hypothesis 2
  Delimitations of the Study 2
  Limitations of the Study 3
  Definition of Terms 3
  Basic Assumptions of the Study 5
  Significance of the Study 6
  Background Information on the Games 8

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 11
  Conceptualizing Power 11
  Methods for Identifying Powerful People . . 14
    Positional Approach 15
    Reputational Approach 17
    Decision Making Approach 23
    Combined Approaches 29
  Summary 34

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY 37
  Selection of Issues 39
  Decisional Approach 42
    Treatment of Data 44
  Reputational Approach 45
    Determination of Sample 46
    Development of Interview Guide 47
    Interviews 51
    Identification of Powerful People Through Manifest Content Analysis of the Number of Nominations 53
    Treatment of Data 56
    Identification of Powerful People Through a Latent Content Analysis of of Interviews 56
    Treatment of Data 59
    Strengths and Weaknesses of Content Analysis 59
  Projected Reputational Method 62

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF DATA 63
  Analysis of Documentation 63
    Commonwealth Games 64
    University Games 69
    Comparison of Powerful People to Test Hypothesis 72
  Manifest Content Analysis of Number of Nominations 73
    Commonwealth Games 75
    University Games 77
    Comparison of Powerful People 79
  Latent Content Analysis of Interviews . . . 81
    Identification of Powerful People and the Commonwealth Games 82
    Reconstruction of Events: Commonwealth Games 83
    Identification of Powerful People and the University Games 94
    Reconstruction of Events: University Games 96
    Comparison of Powerful People to Test Hypothesis 114
  Projected Reputational Method 118

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS 122
  Conclusions from Methodology 122
  Power Structure for Major Sporting Events in Edmonton 127
  Utility of Study for the Practitioner . . . 129
  Suggestion for Further Research 131
  Recommendations for Methodological Approach 132

BIBLIOGRAPHY 138

APPENDIX 1. COVER LETTER 141

APPENDIX 2. LETTER OF INTRODUCTION 143

APPENDIX 3. QUESTIONNAIRE SCHEDULE 145

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	DESCRIPTION	Page
I.	Identification of Powerful People Through Examination of Documents	44
II.	Breakdown of Interview Sample	47
III.	People Interviewed in Study	52
IV.	Nominations for Being Powerful	56
V.	Powerful People Identified Through a Latent Content Analysis of Interviews	59
VI.	Overt Exercise of Power (Commonwealth Games)	65
VII.	Overt Exercise of Power (University Games)	70
VIII.	Manifest Content Analysis of Interviews (Commonwealth Games)	76
IX.	Manifest Content Analysis of Interviews (University Games)	78
X.	Powerful Individuals Identified by Latent Content Analysis of Interviews (Commonwealth Games)	82
XI.	Powerful People Identified Through a Latent Content Analysis of Interviews	95
XII.	Powerful Individual Identified By Three Methods of Analysis Commonwealth Games and University Games	116

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	DESCRIPTION	Page
1.	Type of Power Based on Visibility	13
2.	Type of Power Measured by a Particular Method Affect on Outcome of Issue	123

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

A variety of theories has been developed to explain how community power is structured (Agger et al 1964). There are essentially two underlying ideologies from which the different theories are derived. They are the pluralist approach and the elitist approach. The two ideologies depict community leadership structure in different ways. Briefly, the elitists believe that communities are often directed by small groups of socially or economically privileged persons which function over a wide variety of community issues, over extended period of time. The pluralists believe that no one group directs the community, but that a variety of groups arise according to particular issues and interests. There is no single power structure persisting over a long period of time.

Researchers have devised a variety of methodologies to study real life occurrences, to provide empirical support for one ideology or the other. The methodologies devised tend to support the elitist approach to community power (positional method, reputational method) or to provide support for the pluralist ideology (decision making method). These methodologies tend to bias the findings in favour of one ideology or the other.

The intent of this study was to determine if the same group of people was responsible for bringing both the 1978 Commonwealth Games and 1983 World Student Games to Edmonton. A combined methodology (reputational method and decisional method) was used to identify the powerful and influential people in each event and to determine if there was any overlap in group membership. Past research has been plagued with inaccurate data collection, thus resulting in an inaccurate account of the power structure in the community. A combined approach was used in an attempt to overcome the bias in the methodology, and to more accurately identify any overlap in power structures.

Hypothesis

This study tests the hypothesis that the group of people responsible for bringing the Commonwealth Games to Edmonton, was also responsible for bringing the World Student Games. Depending upon the extent that there is an overlap between the two groups, a persistent power structure related to major sporting events can be said to exist in Edmonton.

Delimitations of the Study

This study focused upon only those people involved, in some capacity, with either the Commonwealth Games and/or the University World Student Games.

Examination of power in the community will only be studied in relation to the 1978 Commonwealth Games and the 1983 World University Games. Only those people involved during the initiation stage of either event will be examined. The study may not therefore reveal all of the important actors in either of the events.

Limitations of the Study

In addition to the delimitations mentioned above, the study is subject to certain limitations. The limitations include:

1. The researcher's inability to gain access to certain individuals and other sources of data (meetings and documentation).
2. Accuracy of data collection and analysis is dependent upon the accuracy of the responses in the interviews.

The Definition of Terms

Power. Power, conceptualized, is the ability of one person to induce another person to do something he or she would not otherwise have done.

Power is operationalized in four ways for this study.

First, people will be considered powerful if their names appear in some form of documentation (i.e., minutes, letters, press reports, etc.) and if they meet any of the five criteria of participation (as stated in Chapter 3). Secondly, all of those people nominated as powerful at least two respondents in the interviews, will also be considered powerful. Thirdly, any person identified in the latent content analysis of interviews as contributing significantly to the outcome of the issue will be considered powerful. Finally, anyone nominated as a key person needed to bring another major sporting event to Edmonton will be considered powerful.

Influence. It is considered to be synonymous with power in this study.

Pluralist Approach. This is the belief that key decisions in a community are determined by a variety of individuals and groups. As well, pluralists believe that these individuals and groups are from a variety of social and economic backgrounds.

Decision Analysis. This is a methodology commonly used by researchers to study the overt aspect of power. Different decisions and issues in a community are examined to determine who was involved, who won and who lost. Results using decision analysis support the pluralist theory. In this study, the method of decisional analysis involves the operationalization of power as being evidenced if a person's name appears in documentation related to the issue.

Elitist Approach. This is the belief that key decisions in the community are dominated by a fairly autonomous few whose interests are relatively cohesive.

Reputational Method. This is also a methodology commonly used to study the actual power structure in the community. It entails asking informants who they think the powerful people are (the people who "get things done"). Results using this methodology tend to provide support for the elitist ideology. In this study, several reputational methods are used, including one equating power with nominations received in interviews with informants; latent content analysis of interviews, and a projected reputational technique.

Initiation Stage. An event can be divided into three stages of development: initiation, implementation and completion.

The initiation stage constitutes the initiation of an idea and its development into a concrete proposal which is accepted by formal authorities.

Basic Assumptions of the Study

1. Power exists and can be measured.
2. The behavior of the power structures in each issue are amenable to empirical study and analysis.

3. Combining the decisional technique with several reputational techniques for studying power will reduce the weaknesses inherent in using the methods separately.
4. It is assumed that the initiation stage for the two events was the most critical and important stage.

Significance of the Study

This study is important for two reasons; firstly, it is theoretically significant and secondly, it is practically useful. With regards to theoretical significance, there is little agreement as to the distribution of power and leadership in communities. The debate is largely due to conceptual differences concerning the definition of power and disagreement as to how to measure it (i.e., to operationalize it) and on which method is most accurate.

In order to overcome some of the methodological and conceptual problems found in the study of power, two steps were taken. Firstly, the two major methods of measuring power were combined. This was done in order to compensate for the opposing bias inherent in each method. It was believed that a more accurate measurement of power would be achieved. Secondly, three techniques were used within the second reputational approach. In the past, researchers defined and operationalized power in restricted ways which tended to preordain the findings about the communities to which they were applied (Ricci 1970, p.173).

This study also has some practical significance. Although researchers do not agree on the question of the distribution of power in a community, they all agree "on the importance of studying leadership processes in order to explain community action or interaction" (Walton in Aiken 1970, p. 443). Research has shown that successful community social action depends on the appropriate involvement of key leaders in the community (Vinton 1970, p. 6). A primary justification for this study resides in the fact that knowledge of and about these prime movers of community change is essential to community workers responsible for initiating change. Recreation professionals can use this knowledge to gather sufficient support to implement needed and worthwhile programmes.

There is still another important need for the study. People responsible for certain policies which affect community life should be revealed so that they can be held accountable for their actions. Floyd Hunter expresses this as a major concern in community leadership.

> ...policies on initial matters affecting community life seem to appear suddenly. They are acted upon, but with no precise knowledge on the part of the majority of citizens as to how these policies originated or by whom they were originally sponsored.... There appears to be a tenuous line of communication between the governors of our society and the governed.... The line of

> communication between leaders and the people needs to be broadened and strengthened - and by more than a series of public relations and propaganda campaigns - else our concept of democracy is in danger of losing vitality in dealing with problems that affect all in common. (Hunter 1953, p. 1)

Lastly, this case study could be applied, to some degree, to other cities in Canada. The Edmonton experience should sensitize the reader to certain influences and relationships which are likely to be found, although not exactly in the same form, in other Canadian cities involved in major sporting events (e.g., Montreal, Calgary). In short, acquaintance with what happened in Edmonton may give some indication of what to look for in other cities.

Background Information on the Games

The Commonwealth Games and the University Games are major international sporting events which occur every four and two years respectively, each time in a different city. The selection of the host city usually occurs several years before the event is to take place. According to a prearranged schedule, each city interested in hosting the event, prepares a document (bid) which contains information on the capacity of the city to host the event, and the measures the city will take to ensure success.

Before a city is allowed to apply for an event, it must compete for the privilege with any other interested cities in its own country. A selection committee at the national level decides which city is to be allowed to represent the country. In turn, a selection committee at the international level decides which country will be allowed to host the event. Proposals are presented to the appropriate selection committees. The various cities try to convince these selection committees that they would put on a more successful event.

The bid process starts at the community level. A person or group of persons gather support at the city level (business organizations, sports organizations, and city councillors) to support the application to host an event. City council, especially, has to be convinced, because it must authorize the bid before the national or international organization will accept it. A private interest group cannot apply to host the Games. In the case of University Games, the University of Alberta also had to sanction the bid. This meant that the Board of Governors had to be convinced of the value of the games.

Much influence is needed to convince a local council (and even the higher levels of government) to bid for such events. A large amount of money is needed to finance them. New facilities may have to be built to hold the various contests and to house the large number of participants. For example, in Edmonton needed new facilities included a stadium, a fieldhouse, tennis courts, velodrome and swimming complex. In addition to the capital cost of the facilities, a large amount of money is needed for the operation of the Games. The University Games, which are twice the size of the Commonwealth Games, involve at least 4,500 competitors and officials from approximately 100 countries.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Conceptualizing Power

There are two aspects of power (overt and covert) which must be taken into consideration when trying to identify whether an elite power structure exists or not. Overt power involves some action taken by a person or group to achieve some specific goal. This action can be readily identified by many people. Pluralist theorists attempt to measure overt power by examining the decision making process. Those people actively involved in making the key decisions within an issue are considered powerful.

Bachrach and Baratz (1970) contend that those key decisions may be made covertly and not in the view of most people. They argue that not all of the powerful may be actively involved. Some decisions may be made because of the expection that a powerful person might oppose or support them, without any overt action on the part of that powerful person. These powerful people mobilize bias in favour of certain outcomes, but without overt activity intended to influence the outcome.

Also some of the issues of importance may have been kept off the decision agenda. The decisions which are allowed to be made by the overtly but less powerful people are relatively unimportant to the covert decision makers who control the order of the agenda. Therefore, bearing in mind this covert aspect of power, the people who are seen by many to be making the decisions may not actually be the most powerful people.

Bachrach and Baratz (1970) refer to this manipulation of the decision agenda as non-decision making. Issues or demands are kept off the agenda and out of the public arena by using various institutional practices (e.g., referrals of problems to committees, limited hearing at a meeting, use of rules or procedures to deny a hearing, control of agendas, etc.).

Decision makers try to mobilize bias in favor of their own interests through these various practices. Some problems are organized into the agenda while others are organized out. To ignore this aspect of power is to ignore the covert but very real aspects of the decision making process in many organizations.

The difference between overt power and covert power lies in their relative visibility. Figure 1 is used to illustrate the relationship between power and visibility. Four variables have been used to show the different combinations possible in an issue. If the input of some people has a significant effect upon the outcome of the issue, these people are influential. Other people may have contributed to the issue in some way, but not significantly. These people are considered to be non-influential. In addition, the input or contribution of each person may have been visible to many people or may have been visible to only a few people. A cross-tabulation of these variables reveals the different aspects of power.

Figure 1. Type of Power Based on Visibility

		Effect on Outcome of Issue	
		Influential	Non-Influential
Individual's Input Into Issue	Visible to many	Overtly Powerful Cell 1	Ceremonial, Formal or Technical Support Cell 2
	Not visible to many	Covertly Powerful Cell 3	Commoner Cell 4

An individual is overtly powerful when the significance of his input or contribution significantly affected the outcome of the issue, and was recognized and visible to many people. An example of this could include the actions of a mayor or businessman in their attempt to gather public support for some proposal in which they are interested.

Cell 2 contains those people who may have contributed in some way, but who were not considered influential. When a person has been visibly involved in an issue, but has not affected (influenced) the outcome to any significant degree then that person fufills either a ceremonial or technical role. The technical role is equivalent to the "leg man" role as developed by Presthus (1964). A "legman" is a person who has been delegated by a superior to fulfill appointed duties. People fulfilling a technical capacity perform some appointed duty.

A ceremonial role refers to some person in a visible (sometimes high) position who is involved because of formal obligations (e.g. presiding over a meeting or rubber stamping a proposal). Such a person may be visibly involved in some way, but his or her input is not significant.

Some people function in a manner which is not visible to many people. Only very few people are aware of their input and its significance to the outcome of the issue. These non-visible but influential people are covertly powerful (cell 3). People involved in the non-decision making and in the mobilization of bias belong in this cell. These are the ones who influence the issue from behind the scenes.

Cell 4 contains the people who are not involved and do not influence the decision making process in any way. The people in this cell are labelled the commoner.

Methods for Identifying Powerful People

The methodology for the study of community decision making through the analysis of the power structure in the community is the subject of much controversy. Disagreement revolves around the same two schools of thought about reality. The elistist theorists believe that a small minority of economic influentials control the decision making process in a community. However, the pluralists propose that the power to make decisions is distributed amongst various diverse groups in a community. This belief holds that no one group controls the decision making process in a community. Each school has developed a conception of power and methods for studying reality which tend to support its belief. They include positional, reputational, and decision analysis and different combinations of these three.

It is important to understand the limitations of each methodology and the effect these have on the results. A number of studies have used one or a combination of methods. Some of these studies will be used as examples to show how data can be affected by the method employed by the researcher.

Positional Approach

The first of the three major techniques to be used in power structure analysis was the positional approach. This technique was used prior to Hunter's study in 1953, most notably by the Lynds (1929). It consists of extensive lists of those individuals holding the greatest number of offices in political and economic organizations in the community. The basic underlying assumption of this approach is that those who occupy key roles in the major social, economic and political institutions of the community are indeed the leaders and key decision makers in the community. A specific example of how this technique is used is given by Charles Bonjean and David Olson.

> Sometimes indexes are computed in an attempt to make the procedures even more precise. Each potential leader is given a total score consisting of a sum of scores for all offices he holds. Top leaders are those with the highest scores (1964, p. 279).

One variation of this approach was used by Sayre and Kaufman (1960) in their study of local government in New York in which they described the major positional actors, their characteristics, their goals and their strategies.

Another important assumption implicit in this approach is that control over important community resources - economic (large firms, corporations, banks, etc.), political office (elected officials) and social (status, civic organizations) - is important to leadership (Hunter 1953 and Wright Mills 1963). The success or failure of this approach to the identification of community decision makers depends upon the degree to which this basic assumption is valid, that those holding positions of authority actually make key decisions while those who do not occupy such positions do not make key decisions (Bonjean and Olson 1960, p. 280). Another problem with the assumption is that some positional leaders do not choose to or are unable to, utilize their potential (Dahl 1961 and Polsby 1960, p. 83).

The positional method is very seldom, if at all, used by itself in analysing community power. It cannot stand alone mainly because the assumption upon which it is based may not be valid for all communities. Position is not necessarily equated with power and its use.

With reference to figure 1 this particular technique tends to over emphasize the ceremonial and formal roles of individuals. It fails to focus on either the covert or the overt aspect of power

Reputational Approach

The second approach used in analyzing community power is the reputational approach. Floyd Hunter (1953) is identified as the first to use this approach for studying community power. This technique has many variations but it primarily consists of asking informants in a community to identify and rank those people who they consider to be community leaders. Informants may be selected in a number of ways, three examples being; 1) by means of a predesignated panel of experts, or 2) by selection of a random sample of community members or 3) by the 'snow ball' technique (ask those people who have been nominated as powerful, who they think of as powerful). In the final analysis, in the determination of the influentials or leaders of the community, a list of names is compiled consisting of either those individuals who received the greatest number of nominations by the key informants or of all leaders whose average ranking is above a certain arbitrary level.

A couple of studies are reviewed here to indicate how the reputational approach is used. Charles Bonjean (1963) in his study of Burlington and William Form and William V. D'Antonio's (1959) study of 2 border cities are examined.

Bonjean (1963) used a two-step reputational analysis to isolate a group of community leaders. The analysis was supplemented with sociometric and interaction data to further delimit this group. An executive secretary of an established community association was asked; "Who are the community leaders who really get things done around here?" (1963, p. 273). He was asked to rank 20 leaders in order of most overall influence in a variety of issue areas. Using this list as a starting point, each of the 20 people mentioned was contacted and asked to do the same. This process was repeated until more duplications than nominations were obtained. Forty-five people were interviewed and their agreement resulted in 16 community leaders. These 16 came from a list of one hundred and sixteen. The scores of each nominee were tabulated - a weight of 20 for first place choice, 19 for second place choice and so on down to twentieth-place choice. Fourteen of the 116 received a score of over a 100, and 2 people had scores of between 90 and a 100. The rest of the people all scored less than 70 and, due to this large discrepancy, were eliminated.

According to Bonjean (1963, p. 273) most reputational studies stop here in regard to reputational approach. His study attempted to gather some extra data to supplement the approach. The leaders were asked to indicate those individuals they had worked with on a variey of specified activities. This constituted the interaction data. It indicated that the Burlington power elites resemble a group more than a collection of separate individuals acting on their own accord.

The second check, sociometric data, is a ranking of leaders within the leadership group and averaging the rank with the non-leader informants. This supplies an average of the different perceptions. The leaders whose scores were approximately the same by both other leaders and non-leaders were called visible leaders. They were perceived by the general public. Those leaders who were ranked high by visible leaders were called concealed leaders. They may have more influence within the power elite circle. The leaders who were ranked higher by the non leaders were considered as symbolic leaders. Bonjean (1963, p. 279) hypothesized that only the first 2 categories possess power and the third category has low relative power.

William Form and William D'Antonio (1959) used the reputational technique simultaneously on 2 cities, one American and the other Mexican. They looked at the integration of the economic and political sphere in each city. It was hypothesized that there would be little difference in social characteristics and participational profiles between the economic and political influentials.

In order to select influentials, interviews were held with "knowledgeables" in business, labour, education, government, religion, mass communications, and 'society' in both communities (1959, pp. 805-806). These people were asked to list those who had the most influence and power in the community. Business and political influentials were viewed as two distinct groupings. Those who received the most consensual nonimations were interviewed, and then further interviews were held with persons whom the influential themselves named as influential. Roughly, 40 people in the economic area and 20 in the political area were finally interviewed in each city.

They found some integration between political and economic influentials and institutions, but not enough to constitute a cohesive group. The responses to problems in the community by either group were by no means identical (1959, pp. 806-814). The data suggest that conflict occurs not along institutional lines but among different coalitions of business and political influentials. These findings do not support the elite theory.

As with the positional technique, criticisms have also been directed towards the reputational technique. A summary of the criticisms follows:

1. The major criticism of this technique is that it tends to emphasize cell 1 (overt aspect of power) and cell 2 (ceremonial, formal or technical support). Essentially, it emphasizes the visibility of the people involved rather than the actual effect they had on the outcome of the decision.

Overt involvement does not automatically make a person powerful. A person may be overtly involved but may only contribute in a very small way. It is important that the contribution towards the outcome of the event should not be neglected. People who may be involved or contribute in a covert manner would receive more emphasis.

The reputational approach also has the potential to identify people who are involved in a covert manner (cell 3). It is important that just the visible aspect of power not be over-emphasized at the expense of the covert aspect.

2. The reputational technique assumes and reports a static distribution of power (Danyger 1964, p. 707 and Wolfinger 1960, pp. 641-642). This assumption carries two implications. One implication is that the same people are held to be powerful in all issues. This approach does not take into account special issues and the variety of people who may, and do, become involved in these issues. A person may be able to wield power in one issue area but not another. Therefore it is misleading to produce general power rankings over all issue areas in the community as reputationalists tend to do.

   The second implication is that power distribution is seen to be more or less permanent or stable in the community. It neglects even the possibility that power may be redistributed through a change in political administration. So decision makers are assumed to remain the same from issue to issue, over time.

3. An a priori assumption is made that a monolithic structure exists. This assumption materializes in the form of a self-fulfilling prophecy by asking leading

questions as to who are the "top ten" leaders in a community. No provision is made for the possible existence of varying structural types. The group of people selected as leaders are automatically assumed to be a 'group' and not just an aggregate that may coalesce or co-operate on some issues.

Studies done by Rossi (1950) and Dahl (1961) reveal that informants are not always knowledgeable and may have misconceptions as to who are the powerful people. Rossi found that Republican politicans complained of successful opposition by ethnic groups because of the activities of local Catholic priests on behalf of the Democratic party. Actually, most of the priests were Republican (Rossi in R. Wolfinger 1960 p. 640). Dahl (1961) found that a number of prominent citizens active in civic affairs were not able to identify other decision makers in the same policy field.

The reputational technique when used by itself has specific shortcomings as with the positional technique. The main shortcoming is that it tends to measure only the visible aspect of power and does not uncover the actual use of resources to gain compliance.

Decision Making Approach

The decision making approach is distinct from the positional and reputational methods. This technique is used to gather empirical data about the activities of the members of the power structure in the community. Empirical data is collected from documents such as newspapers, minutes of meetings, reports, personal correspondence and on occasion from participant observation. Interviews are also used by some proponents of this method, although there are some dangers that may occur similar to those associated with the reputational approach. The decision making approach requires the researcher to select a number of community decisions, or at least some of the more important decisions which occur in different issue areas. If there is considerable overlap between the lists of those involved in the various issues then there is a chance of an elite group of people controlling many of the issue areas, thus supporting the elitist ideology. If there is no overlap in participants in the decision making process then the pluralist ideology is supported.

Dahl (1961, p. 66) examined three issue areas in the same community over a nine year period. Fifty people were chosen to be interviewed according to the frequency with which they successfully initiated important policy over the opposition of others; or vetoed policies initiated by others; or initiated a policy where no opposition appeared. Information obtained through interviewing each participant, examining minutes of meetings, newspapers, witnesses and through personal observation. Participation in each issue area and on various decisions made in the areas revealed that only three leaders initiated or vetoed policies in more than one issue area. Dahl concluded that a pluralist structure existed because the people involved participated only in one issue area and not in another.

Robert Presthus (1964) also used the decision making approach. The reputational approach was used as well, but the focus here was on his use of the decision making technique. In his study "five important decisions were selected in each community and active participation in one or more of these became the basic criterion of individual power" (p. 53). The criteria of important decisions included, the sum of money involved, the number of people affected by the decision (whether the interest of most citizens was roused, or it was important to only a segment of the community), and the need to obtain a roughly "representative" and comparable panel of decisions.

After some initial interviews a panel of decisions that best met these criteria was selected. Presthus rightly points out that an important decision has several dimensions. Decisions are composed of a number of stages, some of which are relatively more crucial than others. In his estimation the initiation stage "was more critical than the implementation stage" (p. 54). He goes on further to differentiate between the actual powerful people, those who initiate decisions, and those who are "leg men". Leg men are the activists who implement the decisions." "Decision makers" however, include those who were directly active in either stage, including those in opposition.

The extent of a person's power was determined mainly by his or her activity in one or more decisions. Whether they were considered decision makers depended upon the nominations given to them by other active participants. All of these people were interviewed and asked about what they did and who they thought played an active role in the decision made. This moves a little into the reputational approach. Essentially, the interview helped to specify the time, extent and involvement of each individual. These lists of decision makers and active participants were checked against newspaper accounts of the decisions and other documents. When documents are used for the analysis, the main strength of the decision making approach is its ability to distinguish overt power, and technical or legman functions. It also provides for a more realistic viewpoint of power relations as a fluid or changing process rather than fixed or static structure. Even with these advantages, this approach also has several inherent limitations. These include the following:

1. The technique only takes into account visible decisions (overt power, cell 1, and cell 2). It makes no account of the fact that power may be and often is exercised by confirming the scope of decision making to relatively safe issues (Bachrach and Baratz 1970, pp. 7-8). Participants who are able to keep latent issues from emerging into open controversy are overlooked. The technique does not provide a means for examining non-decisions (covert power, block 3). According to Bachrach and Baratz it is erroneous to assume that power is solely reflected in concrete decisions.
2. There seems to be no objective criterion for distinguishing between 'important' and 'unimportant' issues arising in the political arena (Bachrach and Baratz, 1970 pp. 10-13). Some of the 'important' issues may not even surface because of some people's efforts. The issues that are left out, are at times, arbitrarily selected by the investigator, or else respondents are asked which they consider the most important community decisions.

There is another problems which occurs when issues are selected which are based on decisions over competing alternatives. The choice of such an issue predetermines a minimum of competing powerful groups and therefore will always support the pluralist ideology. A decision over competing alternatives automatically means that at least two groups are present and are in conflict. However, not all decisions which are made in a community involve a competition between alternatives. Pluralist researchers tend to overlook these.

3. People who appear to be making decisions and thus appear to possess power, may actually be performing ceremonial or technical roles rather than actually making the decisions (Bonjean and Olson 1964, p. 281). Without additional interviews (and therefore more "reputational" data) this method cannot distinguish between overt power and ceremonial, formal or technical involvement. The method also has a problem in that it does not reveal covert power. How does a researcher know whether a decision has been made informally before the meeting by people other than the one who is seen to make the decision in the formal setting? Some decisional studies have involved interviews to ascertain prior informal acts and relationships (Bonjean and Olson 1964, p. 281). These interviews come close to the reputational approach and are vulnerable to the same criticisms.

4. The method is less expedient than either of the others. It is very time consuming to establish an adequate rapport to gain the confidence of people in order to be permitted to attend the informal meetings necessary for participant observation (Bonjean and Olson 1964, p. 281). For example, M. Burgess spent three years in and out of Crescent City while she observed, interviewed and participated in community activities (1960, p. 6). Dahl (1961, p. 336) had relied upon R. Wolfinger to some extent to get some of the 'inside' information. Wolfinger had held an internship in the office of the mayor and was thus able to get certain kinds of information with which to check with information obtained other ways.

Combined Approaches

Many researchers now include a combination of techniques in their study of community power (Freeman et al 1963, Jennings 1964, Presthus 1964, Schulye 1961 and Scoble 1961). The purpose of combining techniques is to have one technique compensate for the weaknesses of the other. Examining decisions by themselves is recognized to overlook non-decisions and the people who are capable of keeping those decisions out of the public's view. To compensate for this, the people who are visible in the decision making process (cell 1 and cell 2) are asked to provide reputational data, the names of other people who influenced the decision.

Through this technique it should be possible to uncover some of the people behind the scenes, or in other words, the covert participants. Both covert and overt participants would be interviewed to see what part each participant played in the issue. By doing this it may be possible to separate both the people who essentially play ceremonial or technical (cell 2) roles in the decision or decisions from those who actually direct, advise and influence decisions and to identify those whose influence is covert. Thus, results are based on information found in all three blocks rather than just one. Results based on just one aspect of power are biased. The other aspects of power are ignored. The failure of one method to measure one aspect of power is compensated by another method's ability to measure covert power.

The reputational approach tends to uncover people who are perceived to be powerful because of an apparent abundance of resources (money, position, authority, connections, etc.). Thus it will probably fail to identify individuals whose interest, energy, and sense of community responsibility propel them into decisions despite their comparative lack of resources (Presthus 1964, p. 424). In Banfield's (1953) study in Chicago, a truck driver who managed to gain the support of the community was very instrumental in the outcome of the decisions concerning the housing issue. Normally he would not have been considered a powerful person and would not have been included on the list. Since he was involved in the decision making process, the decisional technique would classify him as powerful, at least for that issue.

Specialist groups are taken into consideration in the decisional technique. These groups are often issue-oriented and dissipate after the issue has been settled one way or another. These groups tend to possess power and often do influence or affect decisions. This fluidity of changing issues and interest groups is also considered by the decisional approach.

By combining reputational methods and decisions or issue analysis methods, many of the criticisms directed at each method will be met to some degree. Most importantly, the combination of methods will identify both overtly and covertly powerful people. These people are equally important for accurate reconstruction of any possible elitist or pluralist power structures. Both types of powerful people can affect outcomes.

Secondly, prior assumptions concerning existence of monolithic structures will not be made. The threat of a self-fulfilling prophecy is reduced, by rephrasing the questions. Also, assumptions that power is static may be avoided by examining issues at different times. Participant's involvement in different issues will be examined to see if their style of participation and their power changes from one issue to the next.

Thirdly, the expediency of the decisional method could be enhanced somewhat by the economy of the reputational method. The reputational method can easily be incorporated into the study design (Presthus 1964, p. 423). Some of the information which would be collected by attending meetings can be obtained through interviewing participants, even though the information gathered will be affected by the perceptions of participants.

One of the major problems or criticisms which remain is that of the subjectivity of the selection of issues and the decisions to be studied. There is especially a problem of determining what constitutes a non-decision. There has been no clear and objective way of overcoming this problem (Lukes 1974). It has been suggested earlier that participant's perceptions of what was important could be used as an indicator, or, determination of issues could depend upon the interests of the researcher.

Criticism has been leveled at the idea of important issues; eg. what makes it important? As well, there is the possibility that the selection of issues could influence the outcome of the analysis. One possible way to get around it is to analyze an issue which comes up more than once (eg. downtown development).

One last reason for combining techniques is to try to reduce possible methodological and disciplinary bias.

> it is plausible to suspect that some of the reported findings may be artifacts of systematic disciplinary or methodological biases... the disciplinary background of the researcher tends to determine the type of power structure that results from the investigation.
> (Walton in Aiken 1970, p. 450).

Walton's study reveals that method and conclusion as to power structure are highly related, as are discipline and power structure (i.e., sociology and political science).

Nelson Polsby (1980, pp. 145-149) argues vehemently that Walton's data is incorrect and that he had misquoted other researchers. If this is true, then another example can be used to show at least the difference a method can make in data analysis. Jenning's (1964) study of Atlanta used two approaches, reputational and positional. Although he may have interviewed the same people as Hunter had in his study, Jennings (1964, p. 194) came up with different conclusions about the power structure. Jennings based his analysis on the data collected from influentials identified through the positional technique, and not on information gathered by the reputational approach.

Summary

The results which are obtained in a study are dependent upon the way in which power is conceptualized and the method utilized to measure it. Bias was introduced to many of the results of past studies because of problems with conceptualizing power in a limited manner. The method which was developed to measure that aspect tended to predetermine the results. Many studies failed to identify both the covert and the overt aspects of power and they failed to distinguish between the visibility of a person, their formal, ceremonial or technical role and their actual contribution to the outcome of the decision.

This study recognizes that power should not be conceptualized in a narrow manner. Figure 1 illustrates how power can be divided into four different aspects. People who are influential and who are visible to many people are considered to be overtly powerful (cell 1). Some people may be visibly, or overtly involved in the event, but they may not have affected the outcome of the decision to any great degree. These people are visible but not powerful. These people perform purely ceremonial, or formal or technical roles (cell 2). There are other people who affect the outcome of the decision to a great degree and who are not visible to many people. These people are covertly powerful (cell 3). Covertly powerful people may not even affect the decision making directly (i.e., make a conscious effort to affect the outcome of the decision). Their mere presence alone, may affect the judgement and actions of those people who are actively and visibly involved. People who may be covertly powerful may be much more powerful than those who are visibly and actively involved.

Each aspect of power has to be operationalized in a different manner in order to be measured. The first way in which power is operationalized involves the identification of those people who were visibly and actively involved in the decision making process. As Robert Dahl contends, those people who are not only involved but also triumphant, can be considered powerful. Essentially, involvement is the key to the identification (or measurement) of the first aspect of power.

The second way power is operationalized is through the perceptions of people involved in the event. Each individual has their own perception as to who they think is powerful. Therefore, people are considered powerful depending upon whether they are nominated as such by other people involved in the event.

Finally, the covert aspect of power has to be operationalized. There are some people who are never actively or visibly involved in an event but who may still significantly affect the outcome of the event. In addition, there are people who do contribute in a way in which few people involved in the event may perceive. The key to operationalizing covertly powerful people is by identifying the significance of the person's input into the final outcome of the event. A person does not have to be visibly involved or receive a number of nominations in order to significantly affect the outcome of the event. Essentially, the significance of a person's input to the outcome of the event determines whether a person can be considered powerful.

Three different methods have to be developed in order to measure the three different ways of operationalizing power. One method has to provide information pertaining to those people who were visibly involved on the winning side. The second method has to collect information pertaining to different people's perceptions of who was powerful. The last method has to be able to determine the significance of a person's input (whether it was active or passive) and how it affected the outcome.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

A review of the literature reveals that past research projects has operationalized power in only one or two ways. For this study power is operationalized in three ways. People who were involved in an overt manner were considered powerful. In the second instance those who were nominated as powerful by others were also considered powerful. Finally, those people who significantly affected the outcome of the event in an indirect or nonvisible manner were considered to be covertly powerful.

Two basic approaches, decisional and reputational, incorporating four particular methods (examination of documents, manifest analysis of number of nominations, latent content analysis of interviews and projected reputational) were used to measure the three different aspects of power identified in Chapter 2.

Different sources of documentation were examined to identify people who were involved in the support or opposition to the event. This method measures overt power (cell 1). It also tends to identify those who fulfilled ceremonial, technical and formal roles (cell 2). The major problem with this method is that it fails to indicate the relative power of the various individuals.

A manifest analysis of nominations also tends to identify overt power and ceremonial, formal or technical roles. However, by asking for nominations associated with specific roles, rather than just for nominations as "powerful" in this method it was possible to discriminate between those overtly influential and those performing ceremonial, technical and formal roles. Also this method does provide a measure of the relative amount of power of various individuals.

The covert aspect of power (cell 3) was measured by the latent content analysis of interviews. Information provided by the interviews was analyzed to identify instances of non-decisions and the use of mobilization of bias.

A fourth method, projected reputational approach, was instituted to gather further information concerning people who would be needed to obtain another major sporting event. The purpose of this approach was to provide a further time extension to determine whether the same people (thus showing a continuous elite structure) or different people would be involved. However, the results obtained by this measure tended to emphasize positions (cell 2) rather than individuals falling in either cell 1 or cell 3.

The discussion of the methodology is divided into three major parts. First is an explanation of the selection of the issues which were studied. This is followed by a discussion of the procedures for the identification of powerful people through the decisional approach. The final section includes a discussion of the reputational approach and the procedures used to identify powerful people through this approach.

Selection of Issues

Two similar issues which occurred years apart were selected for study. This eliminated two criticisms plaguing past research. The first criticism concerns the measurement of static power and the second criticism has to do with the selection of controversial issues.

The first criticism arises as a result of the static measurement of power which is found when examining different issues at the same time. When power is measured at one point in time, it appears to be stable and unchanging. A false interpretation of the power structure would result. The people or groups which appear to be powerful during one issue may not even become involved in a similar issue a year later. A continuous power structure may not exist but an interpretation based on this one instance will point to the existence of a continuous power structure (an elite group of decision makers).

One way of getting around this problem is by examining similar issues at different times. This reveals whether the same people are involved over a length of time which would in turn suggest that some sort of power structure does exist (at least in that particular decision area). Thus the possibility of a fluctuating power structure can be taken into account by examining similar issues at different times.

The second criticism of past research arises when researchers examine a variety of issues. Issues which are selected are often by definition "controversial" (Presthus 1964). Whenever there is an issue to be resolved, there are at least two opposing groups involved. When a variety of issues are examined, each of which are controversial, a variety of opposing groups will be found. Thus a multiple elite or a pluralist power structure would be perceived. If similar issues are studied at different times, either the same group (or the same powerful people) will be involved in both issues or different people will be involved in each issue. The purpose of this study was to reveal if the power structure responsible for bringing the Commonwealth Games to Edmonton was the same power structure which obtained the University World Student Games. If the same group of people were involved in both issues then a power structure could be considered to exist through time. If different people were involved, then no persistent power structure would be considered to exist.

The two particular events were selected not only because they were essentially non-controversial during the initial stage, but also because of the researcher's interest in the planning of major events.

In addition, certain limitations had to be placed on the area of investigation to make the study more manageable. On initial review of the issues, several hundred people were involved. Therefore, following the examples of Presthus (1964) and Hawley (1963), the events were broken down into different stages of development. Presthus (1964, p. 54) and Hawley (1963, p. 424) proposed that each issue, or decision, is composed of a number of stages, some of which are relatively more crucial than the other. Presthus divides the decision into two parts, initiation and implementation. Hawley identifies three stages; planning, execution and completion. The execution stage is comparable to the initiation stage. Both are assumed to be the most crucial of all of the stages. Each (execution and initiation) is characterized by a 'nothing-to-something' aspect. This is considered the 'take off' stage, as in getting the issue accepted and underway.

For this study, only the initiation stage was examined because it has been described as the most critical stage. This stage includes the time from the initial inception of the idea (for each event) to the formal acceptance or adoption of the proposal by City council and by the provincial government.

Decisional Approach

The decisional approach was utilized to determine who was powerful in an overt manner. It attempted to reconstruct the power structure by gathering empirical data concerning peoples' actual behaviour and their use of resources in the decision making process.

The empirical evidence needed to identify the people involved in the decision making process was gathered only through the examination of a variety of documents. Tracing the behaviour of individuals involved in the decision making process can also be accomplished through interviews. However, using data from interviews bordered on the reputational approach (Bonjean and Molson in Mott and Aiken 1970, p. 206).

A variety of documents were obtained from various sources. Newspaper and magazine articles obtained from the Edmonton Sun, Edmonton Journal, The Gateway (University of Alberta student newspaper) and Alberta Report, ranging from 1968 to 1978 (Commonwealth Games) and from 1979 to 1982 (University Games) were utilized. In addition several committee reports (joint commitee from the city and the university responsible for developing the bid for the university games) and minutes of meetings (Canadian Commonwealth Association meetings, City council meetings and meetings from the joint committee responsible for developing the bid for the university games) were supplied by some of the people involved in the initial stage of each event. The time period for these meetings ranged from 1968 to 1972 (Commonwealth Games) and from 1979 to 1981 (University Games).

Some personal correspondence of individuals involved in each event, concerning each event, was made available to the researcher on a confidential basis. The information obtained in this type of correspondence proved to be useful in identifying the private activities of several people involved in each event.

In addition, Ivor Dent's (exmayor of Edmonton) published biography "Getting the Games" (1977) was also examined. This book is based upon his involvement and recollections of the early stages of the Commonwealth Games.

All of these documents were examined to determine who was involved and who was responsible for making the decisions. For this method, individuals who met the following criteria of participation were considered powerful.

These criteria, as developed by Presthus (1964, p. 56), include:

> active membership on a committee selected to handle the problem; contacting others on behalf of (or against) the proposed decision; speaking before interested groups about the decision; and contributing funds to publicize or otherwise support (or defeat) the proposed decision.

These were activities falling within Cell 1 (overt power). However, an additional category developed by Freedman et al. (1963, p. 791), was also added. Individuals who were formally responsible for making the decisions, were also considered powerful (cell 2, formal power).

Documents concerning each event were examined and the people meeting any of the above criteria were represented in (Table 1) along with the roles they portrayed.

Table 1 Identification of Powerful People Through Examination of Documents

	Powerful People	
NAME	POSITION	ROLE(S)

Treatment of Data

To test the hypothesis, people identified as powerful for each event (by each of the four methods) were compared to determine the extent of overlap. For the hypothesis to be accepted (in this test and in the following tests), a 40% overlap must occur. Robert Presthus, after an examination of other studies, considered an overlap of this magnitude as significant and suggested it could be used as a "rough index of elitism" (1964, p. 94). He reviewed the levels of overlap at which different authors accepted or rejected their findings. Some authors reported that they did not find strong evidence from an overlap of 6% to 37%. Therefore, Presthus decided that 40% was acceptable for all intents and purposes.

Presthus does not state that 40% is the definitive cut off point for determining whether an elite group exists. Rather, he states that it provides a rough index on which to base a decision (based upon past research). In the absence of any more rigorous standard, that established by Presthus has been used here.

Reputational Approach

Through a review of past research, it has been recognized that the decisional method does not identify people who are powerful in a covert manner. As stated earlier, not all of the important discussions and meetings which occur between people become documented. As well, an examination of a document may reveal a person's actions but does not show who, if anyone, may have influenced their actions. This "behind the scenes" type of data can be gathered through personal interviews with the individuals who participated in the initial stage.

Three particular reputational oriented methods were used to identify the people who may have been powerful in a covert manner. They include a manifest analysis of data collected in the interviews, a latent content analysis of interviews and a projected reputational method. These will be discussed further after the procedures for the development and the implementation of the interview guide have been explained.

Determination of Sample

Only those people involved in the initial stage of each issue were considered. This limitation greatly reduced the scope of the study and the number of people to be interviewed. The sample was obtained by using the snowball technique incorporated by Conway (1973), Freedman et al. (1963), and Presthus (1964). People initially identified by the decision method (examination of documents) were interviewed and asked, among other things, to identify other people involved in the issue. These people in turn were interviewed and were also asked to do the same. This process occurred 23 times resulting in the identification of 54 people.

Although 54 people were identified only 24 people were eventually interviewed. As can be seen in table II there were several reasons why 55% of the people were not interviewed.

Table II

BREAKDOWN OF INTERVIEW SAMPLE

Total Number of Sample:	54	Continually Postponed Interviews	6
Interviewed:	24	Outright Refused Interviews	2
Deceased:	2	*Received Only One Nomination	7
Live Outside of Province:	8		
Could not be Reached (Did Not Return Calls)	5		

* Little or nothing was gained through interviews with people with only one nomination. Therefore, others receiving only one nomination were not interviewed.

Development of Interview Guide

The personal, focussed, interview was selected as the most suitable method for gathering the necessary data from individuals. In order to enhance flexibility and to encourage greater depth in responses, open-ended questions were incorporated. This type of question enabled the researcher to establish a good rapport with the respondent. This rapport may further enhance the depth of responses by putting the respondent in a more relaxed frame of mind, thereby resulting in candid and detailed accounts of what respondents perceived to have transpired. Also, various interesting responses could be probed further by the interviewer. These responses were later analysed using both manifest and latent content analysis.

Several other factors were taken into consideration in developing the instrument. They include, length of interview, wording of questions, and explanation of terms. These factors have all been mentioned in other power studies as problem or potential problem areas. By following the recommendations of other studies, it was hoped that many of these problems would be overcome.

Previous researchers in this area have commented upon the length of interviews (Dahl 1964, Smart and Highley 1977). Some studies have reported interviews of three to four hours in length. Most of the people to be interviewed would not be able to commit that much time to an interview. In the pre-test, almost all of the people contacted asked how much time was required. The interview was thus designed to require a minimum of thirty minutes to an hour. When respondents were contacted they were told that it would take approximately an hour.

Wording of the questions was another common problem. Wording should be such that the respondent understands what is being asked. Questions should be clear, concise and free of any jargon. As well, questions should not be structured so as to bias a person's response. The following is an example of a leading question commonly used; "Who do you perceive are the top ten most powerful people?" This type of question calls for the name of ten people. A respondent may only be able to think of five or six and subsequently guesses at the rest. The data would, therefore, be inaccurate. For this study, a maximum or minimum number of responses was not stipulated.

It was also important to define certain terms which were used in the questionnaires. All respondents must have the same understanding of what is being asked. If terms were not explained, people would interpret the question in a number of different ways. The information obtained could not be compared because, essentially, respondents would be responding to different questions.

The questions were designed to supplement the data collected in the decisional approach. In order to identify the people involved in the dealings and contacts which occurred behind the scenes, participants were interviewed and asked a number of questions (APPENDIX III).

Question 2 was designed to provide data concerning a person's perception of his own involvement in either issue. Respondents were asked to recount what they did during the initial stage.

The third followed question 2 very closely. It required the respondents to expand their perception of their own involvement to include those people with whom they were in contact. This question was designed to reveal some of the interactions which occurred between people.

The next question was designed to collect information about the behaviour of people who were actively involved. Respondents were asked to recount the actions of other people who they perceived had a significant effect upon the outcome of the event.

The basic reputational approach to reveal covert power was utilized in question 5. Respondents were asked to give their opinion as to who they perceived to be significant in the outcome of the events, but who were not publically involved.

The purpose of the next question was to give the respondents an opportunity to reflect upon their statements and possibly recall information they had forgotten.

Finally, question seven was designed to provide an increased time extension to the study. Respondents were asked to identify the people whose support they perceived would be necessary or essential to secure the bid for another major sporting event (i.e., Pan-Am Games). Its purpose was to assist in determining if there was a persistent power structure responsible for obtaining major sporting events.

The major concerns in the development of the questionnaire included: understanding of terms, obtaining the desired data and leading questions. The questionnaire was pretested on people involved in two other similar sporting events, (1978 Alberta Summer Games and the 1984 Alberta Summer Games). A total of ten people were interviewed in the pretest. Questions were reworded and rearranged. As well, constructive comments from the advisory committee were used to improve the questionnaire format. After several readjustments to the schedule, and further testing, the instrument was printed in final form.

Interviews

A cover letter (APPENDIX I) and a letter of reference from the university (APPENDIX II) were mailed to thirty-one people. Three other people were contacted by telephone because their address was not readily available. The cover letter explained the purpose of the study and included a request for a personal interview. About 3 to 5 days after the letters were mailed, each person was contacted by telephone to arrange a time for an interview.

All of the interviews were conducted in 1982 during the months of April, May and the first two weeks of June. A large majority of the interviews were scheduled after repeated calls. Many of the respondents were very busy and had to change their appointments several times.

Out of the possible 54, the following 24 people were interviewed (figure 4). Included in table III is a review of the position each respondent held during the initiation stage of each event (1968-1972 Commonwealth Games and 1978-1981 University Games). Position refers to the political office held during this stage or the person's source of economic support (job).

Table III **People Interviewed in Study**

NAME	POSITION DURING INITIAL STAGE OF COMMONWEALTH GAMES	POSITION DURING INITIAL STAGE OF UNIVERSITY GAMES
* Al Adair	Provincial Minister	Provincial Minister
Bert Hohol	Provincial Minister	
Ivor Dent	Mayor of Edmonton	
Cec Purves		Mayor of Edmonton
* Alex Fallow	Alderman	Businessman
Dave Ward	Alderman	
Percy Wickman		Alderman
* Ron Hayter	Alderman	Alderman
Bill McLean	Alderman	
Jim Armstrong	Parks & Rec. Planner (City)	
* Ron Ferguson	Parks & Rec. Planner (City)	Special Events Co-ordinator (City)
George Hughes	City Commissioner	
Larry Healy	Alberta Diving Coach	
Hugh Munroe		Supt. of Recreation
Myer Horowitz		President of University of Alberta
Dan Kanishiro		Investment Officer (University)
Mel Poole		Assoc. Vice-President of Finance (University)
Herb McLachlin		Dean of the Faculty of Physical Education
Ross Macnab		Assoc. Dean of Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation
* Maury Van Vliet	Dean of the Faculty of Physical Education	Retired
* Ed Zemrau	Director of Athletic Services (University)	Director of Athletic Services (University) and President of C.I.A.U.
Alex Romanuik	School Principal & President of Canadian Amateur Wrestling Assoc.	
Alf Savage		Commissioner of Public Affairs
Roger Burrows		Track & Field Coach

* INVOLVED IN BOTH EVENTS

Respondents had the option of being recorded on tape, or by note taking. Twenty agreed to be taped, two refused and two more were interviewed over the phone (handwritten notes were taken). Out of the twenty taped interviews, sixteen were transcribed. Four of the interviews did not warrant the cost of being transcribed (these interviews consisted of the people with only one nomination). The four hand recorded interviews were written in point form.

Most of the respondents indicated they could not spare much time so the interviews had to be relatively short. The interviews were designed to require about forty minutes to complete. In fact they ranged from twenty minutes to two hours. Interviews taking longer than thirty minutes were a result of the interest on behalf of the respondent. Also, all respondents were promised that their responses were to be kept confidential.

Identification of Powerful People Through Manifest Content Analysis of the Number of Nominations

An examination of documentation provided a very narrow scope for identifying powerful people. Through this second method individuals were also considered powerful if they were nominated as such by respondents to the interviews. One of the functions of the interview guide was to elicit nominations of powerful people. Respondents were asked to state who they perceived was powerful and why (what was their role or contribution?). A form of manifest content analysis (Babbie 1979) was used to analyze the contributions or roles of each person. The actions or roles mentioned were divided into six different categories. These categories were based on the work of Presthus (1964, p. 59). The number of categories was expanded to encompass all of the comments made by the respondents. These categories include:

1. Organizing people and duties - The person or persons who initiate the idea and organize support. This includes contacting of persons and groups.
2. Liaison - This person provides an affiliation or connection with another person, group or organization. A person uses connections with outside people or groups to enlist their support for the issue.
3. Provision of advice and expertise - Some people influence the decisions of others through their advice and recommendations. This influence is based on the recognition of their knowledge and capabilities.
4. Providing authorization - Use of position in an organization to provide formal support (in the form of consent and/or funds).

5. Preparing Documentation - This category entails all of the purely technical work. Such work includes feasibility studies, budgeting, planning and the drafting of the booklets presented to council, and the national bodies (e.g., Federal government, C.I.A.U. and Canadian Commonwealth Association).
6. Opposition - This includes all actions taken by persons or groups to defeat the proposal.

Categories 1, 2, 3 and 6 were considered to be examples of overt influence (cell 1 in diagram 1) while 4 and 5 were examples of formal, ceremonial and technical roles (cell 2).

All of the people identified in the interviews were listed in their prospective events according to the roles they were perceived to have fulfilled and according to the number of nominations (most to least). The number of nominations were listed in numerical form (table IV).

In order to be considered powerful, participants had to receive at least 2 or more nominations. Two nominations were required to guard against bias due to mistakes of memory, the inclusion of friends and accidental contacts.

Table IV Nominations for Being Powerful

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

Categories of Contributions and Roles in Event
NAME
POSITION
ORGANIZING PEOPLE
LIAISON
ADVICE AND EXPERTISE
AUTHORIZATION
TECHNICAL
OPPOSITION
TOTAL NUMBER OF NOMINATIONS

Treatment of Data

As in the first measure, the people identified as powerful for the Commonwealth Games were compared to those for the University Games to determine the extent of overlap. For the hypothesis to be accepted an overlap of 40% must occur.

Identification of Powerful People Through a Latent Content Analysis of Interviews

Open ended questions were used to gather extensive detailed data for the purpose of reconstructing the development of the initial stage to reveal the patterns of power and influence. This method reveals those who were overtly involved (cells 1 and 2) and those who may have contributed in a more covert and/or passive manner (cell 3).

The degree or importance of a person's involvement should not be based only upon a manifest analysis of the number of nominations each receives. Tabulating the total number of nominations does not necessarily show how powerful an individual is. Rather, it provides an indication of the relative visibility of that person and his or her actions.

A latent content analysis of the interviews provided a more extensive analysis of the perceived powerful people and their influence on others. The quality of their contribution was important, not the quantity. A person with few nominations may have affected the outcome of the issue more than a person with many nominations (i.e., a person with greater visibility).

A form of latent content analysis was used to examine respondents' perceptions to determine who was powerful and why. This form of analysis allows the researcher to "consider not only what was said but also in the context in which it was said, the precise form of words in which it was expressed and the strength of feeling or commitment evident in the statement" (Burton 1981, p. 17).

The underlying feelings of the respondents were clear in the extra emphasis and the various statements.

As in Burton's (1981) study of regional planning commissions in Alberta, this part of the study describes the perceptions of respondents concerning the roles of others (and the relevance of those roles in the final outcome of the event) and attempts to appraise the significance of these perceptions. Quantitative forms of analysis such as frequency counts and tests of significance were not used.

The decision to determine whether a person was considered to be powerful or not was based upon the researcher's overall assessment of what was said about each person and the context in which it was said (Babbie 1973, p. 229). More clearly, those people who were perceived to have contributed significantly to the outcome of the issue (as stated by respondents) were identified as powerful.

Although a latent content analysis of interviews was much more subjective than the previous methods of identification, it can provide a more accurate or detailed account of the patterns of influence. This is possible because it has the potential to identify both covert and overt holders of power.

Those people who were judged to be powerful through the latent content analysis were listed (Table V). Although all of the people listed were considered powerful, some were considered more powerful than the others. The effect their contribution had on the actions of others and on the final outcome, were more pronounced. These key influential people received an asterix beside their name:

Table V Powerful People Identified Through A Latent Content Analysis of Interviews

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

NAME	POSITION	KEY INFLUENTIAL

Treatment of Data

The lists of both events were compared to determine the extent of overlap. As with the other tests, an overlap of 40% was considered necessary to accept the hypothesis.

Strength and Weaknesses of Content Analysis

As stated earlier, content analysis is capable of tapping underlying relationships. Examining the context in which something is said, facilitates the understanding of the feeling and commitment behind a statement. However, analyzing the context of how something is said, requires judgment on the part of the researcher. Problems of reliability and validity stem from this subjective aspect of content analysis and especially from this qualitative or latent form of analysis.

Reliability is suspect, because of the subjective manner in which the data is analyzed. There is no guarantee that another person would interpret the data from the interviews in the same way, or come to the same conclusions. Another potential problem is the standards and definitions of measurement may not remain constant throughout the study.

Reliability was increased by doing a pretest on two other sporting events in Alberta (i.e., 1978 Alberta Summer Games and the 1984 Alberta Summer Games). Each question in the interview schedule, including the hypothetical question, produced the same types of responses. The type of behaviours exhibited by the participants were similar and could also be divided into the six categories previously mentioned. Responses were analyzed according to what was said (about another's contribution), as well as how it was said. A similar pattern (of what was powerful and influential) was obtained in both of the issues This was again evident in the main study. Responses and results were obtained in the pretests similar to those obtained in the main study. The pretest indicated that an adequate degree of reliability (or consistency) had been attained.

Validity is also considered to be a problem when using content analysis (Carney 1972, p. 193). Construct validity and content validity tend to be very problematic (Babbie 1975, p. 234 and Carney 1972, pp. 193-201).

Construct validity has to do with whether a particular test can be shown to measure a hypothetical construct. In this case, the test involves measuring something that is not directly observable (i.e., are the same people powerful and influential for both issues). Power and influence are not observable in themselves but can only be observed through people's actions. Therefore, behaviour is the key to measuring a person's exercise of power or influence. How one behaves or how one is seen to behave and how others perceive one's behaviour are the critical indicators of power. Subsequently, these are the bases for which the measurement of power and influence is attained. A simple comparison of persons in both issues determine whether a power elite exists.

Content validity is somewhat similar to construct validity. It involves the "determination that the content of the measure is an adequate and representative sample of the content universe of the property being measured". (Carney 1972) In other words, are the components of power being measured?

Steps were taken to increase content validity by operationalizing power in a broader manner and then measuring it with three different methods. A major weakness in past research was the problem of conceptualizing power in too narrow a manner. Either the covert or the overt aspect was measured, not both. In studying the variety of conceptions of power, different people have come up with different methods. Since people perceive power in a variety of ways, it should be operationalized in a variety of ways also. This has been done for this study.

Projected Reputational Method

A hypothetical case was incorporated into the questionnaire in order to provide supplemental data. The data from the hypothetical case was to be compared to data collected previously to determine whether an elite power structure exists over time. Respondents were asked to identify the people they perceived would be essential for securing another major sporting event. Those mentioned were to be compared to the people identified as powerful in the three previous methods in order to determine any further overlap.

This method is similar to the second method (the manifest analysis of the number of nominations). It is also based upon people's perceptions of who they perceive are powerful. The main difference being that they are asked to state who would be essential for the future event rather than being asked who was powerful in a past event.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Four methods were used to gather and analyze data in order to identify those people who were responsible for bringing the major sporting events to Edmonton. The people identified as powerful in each event (by each method) were compared to determine the extent of overlap. The option to accept or reject the hypothesis was not limited to the results from one methodology. Three other methods were included to determine if the results were different.

This chapter is divided into four sections; analysis of documentation, manifest content analysis of number of nominations, latent content analysis of interviews, and projected reputational. Data obtained by each method was analyzed, and the people identified as being influential in either event were listed. These lists were then compared to test the hypothesis.

Analysis of Documentation

The identification of powerful people was based entirely upon empirical evidence collected from a variety of documents concerning individuals' participation in the decision making process. People identified by this method were considered to be overtly powerful. These people were openly and actively involved in using their resources to bring a major sporting event to Edmonton.

Individuals were considered to be powerful if their involvement in the issue (as ascertained in a document) met one of the four criteria developed by Presthus:

> ...active membership on a committee selected to handle the problem; contacting others on behalf of (or against) the proposed decision; speaking before interested groups about the decision; and contributing funds to practice or otherwise support (or defeat) the proposed decision (1964, p. 56)

One additional criteria was added, individuals who were formally responsible for the decision were also considered powerful.

Data pertaining to the Commonwealth Games was analyzed first followed by an analysis of the University Games data. The findings from each issue were then compared to test the hypothesis.

Commonwealth Games

There were a number of people involved in the initial stage, however, only seventeen of them met the criteria and were considered powerful according to this first measure. They are listed along with their positions (held during the initial stage) and the role(s) they played in (Table VI). Included in this analysis is a short description of the role(s) each person played.

Col. Jack Davis was considered to be powerful primarily due to the fact that he was Chairman of the Site Selection

Table VI

Overt Exercise of Power

Individuals Identified in Documents as Actively Exercising Power in the Two Major Sporting Events

COMMONWEALTH GAMES Name	Position During Initiation Stage	Roles
Col. Jack Davies	President, Canadian Commonwealth Assoc.	Formal authority
Alex Romaniuk	School Principal and President Amateur Wrestling Association	Contact people for support
Ivor Dent	Mayor, City of Edmonton	Formal authority; gain Council support
Una McLean Evans	Alderman, City of Edmonton	On Public Affairs Committee that approved bid
Ron Hayter	Alderman, City of Edmonton	On Public Affairs Committee that approved bid
Terry Cavanaugh	Alderman, City of Edmonton	On Public Affairs Committee that approved bid
Ches Tanner	Alderman, City of Edmonton	On Public Affairs Committee that approved bid
Ed Zemrau	Director, Athletic Services, U. of A.	On committee to gather support
Maury Van Vliet	Dean, Faculty of Physical Education, U. of A.	On committee to gather support
Hal Pawson	Public Relations, City of Edmonton	On committee to gather support
Ted Peterson	Executive of Fitness and Amateur Sport, National Government	Gave information to Romanuik. Lobbied Davies.
Peter Lougheed	Premier of Alberta	Formal and financial support needed to convince City Council
Al Adair	Minister, Parks and Recreation	Advised Premier and Cabinet to support the bid.
Horst Schmid	Minister, Youth and Cultural Development	Advised Premier and Cabinet to support the bid.
Larry Healy	Coach, Alberta Diving Team	Advised Rispin to approach Davies.
Philip Rispin	Diver	First to approach Davies to bring Games to Edmonton.
Dave Ward	Alderman	Contact people for support.

Committee which was responsible for deciding which Canadian city would be granted the privilege to hold the event. In addition, he supported the Edmonton bid by providing advice to the city's steering committee on how to develop their proposal.

Alex Romaniuk (School Principal and President of the Canadian Amateur Wrestling Association) was very active publically in his efforts to obtain the support of others to bring the event to Edmonton. In fact he was responsible for initiating the idea by forming a steering committee to contact others for support.

The three people Romaniuk secured for the steering committee included Ed Zemrau (Director of Athletic Services, University of Alberta), Dr. Maury Van Vliet (Dean of the Faculty of Physical Education) and Hal Pawson (Public Relations Department, City of Edmonton). These people contacted the university, the city and prominent Edmontonians for support.

Dr. Ivor Dent (then the Mayor of Edmonton) had a very important role. As mayor he was formally responsible for submitting the bid. The Site Selection Committee required the formal approval of the mayor of the City before it would even evaluate the proposal to host the event.

In addition, Dent was also responsible for getting the city council to approve the bid. He had put the proposal on the council's agenda and persuaded many of the councillors to support it.

Another person meeting the criteria of involvement was Ted Peterson. He was on the national executive directorate for Fitness and Amateur Sport. Through his position and his expertise, he was able to supply a lot of information and guidance to Alex Romaniuk. As well, Peterson lobbied Col. Jack Davies and the National Commonwealth Committee to support Edmonton's bid.

A group of city councillors was identified as powerful. Una McLean Evans, Ron Hayter, Terry Cavanaugh and Ches Tanner were on the Public Affairs Committee (a standing committee of City council). The committee's function was to examine the proposal and to make recommendations to the rest of council. The committee supported the proposal and advised the council to do the same.

One other person very involved in the decision to obtain the event was Alderman Dave Ward. He had taken a personal interest in the decision and had contacted a number of people (e.g., Mayor Dent, Premier Lougheed, Col. Davies and fellow councillors) to elicit their support. He was also very outspoken in his support on radio and in the newspapers.

Premier Lougheed was also involved in the initial stage. He provided the formal authority for authorizing the needed monetary support for the development of the sports facilities. The city could not afford to host the event by itself.

Two other people at the provincial level, who gave their public support to the event were Horst Schmid (Minister of Youth and Cultural Development) and Al Adair (Minister of Parks and Recreation). Essentially, the event fell within the jurisdiction of these two ministers who were therefore formally responsible for obtaining information to advise the premier and the rest of the provincial cabinet on a course of action.

Lastly, Larry Healy and Philip Rispin were accredited, by some sources (newspaper article and a committee report), as being the first people to approach Col. Davies to suggest the games be held in Edmonton. During a diving competition, Healy (coach of Alberta diving team) asked Rispin (a member of the diving team) to approach Col. Davies to ask what the chances were for the Games to be hosted by Edmonton.

Other people were involved in the initial stage but were not considered powerful because they had performed either a purely technical role (i.e., compiled information, feasibility studies) or they were in opposition to the issue. These two roles did not meet the criteria as set down by Presthus.

University Games

Upon examination of documentation using the aforementioned criteria, 21 people were identified as being powerful in an overt and/or active manner. These people are listed, along with their position and the role(s) they fulfilled in (Table VII).

The majority of people listed in Table VII were involved in a joint-committee made up of representatives from the university and representatives from the city administration. The committee's purpose was to do all of the planning and ground work needed to put a proposal together. In addition, certain members were responsible for obtaining the support of other individuals involved with the provincial government, with local and national sports agencies and with local businessmen. Members representing the city of Edmonton included Doug Burrows (Chief Commissioner), Alf Savage (Commissioner of Public Affairs), Hugh Munroe (Superintendent of Recreation), Jim Armstrong (Planner for Parks and Recreation), Ron Ferguson (Special Events Co-ordinator), and Jan Connors (Planner for Parks and Recreation). Representing the university were Ed Zemrau (Director of Athletic Services), Herb McLachlin (Dean of Physical Education), Ross Macnab (Associate Dean of Physical Education), Mel Poole (Associate Vice-President of Finance), Ron Phillips (Vice President of Facilities) and Don Kanashiro (Investment Officer).

Table VII

Overt Exercise of Power

Individuals Identified in Documents as Actively Exercising Power in the Two Major Sporting Events

WORLD UNIVERSITY GAMES Name	Position	Roles
Cec Purves	Mayor, City of Edmonton	Member of joint City/U of A Committee to develop bid, and gain support. Gain support of City Council. Contacted Federal government for support
Doug Burrows	Chief Commissioner	Member, joint City/U of A committee.
Alf Savage	Commissioner, Public Affairs	Member, joint City/U of A committee.
Hugh Monroe	Superintendent, Parks and Recreation	Member, joint City/U of A committee.
Jim Armstrong	Planner, Parks & Recreation	Member, joint City/U of A committee.
Ron Ferguson	Special Events Coordinator	Member, joint City/U of A committee.
Jan Connors	Planner, Parks and Recreation	Member, joint City/U of A committee.
Ron Phillips	V.P. Facilities, U. of A.	Member, joint City/U of A committee.
Ed Zemrau	Director, Athletic Services, U. of A.	Member, joint City/U of A committee.
Herb MacLachlin	Dean, Physical Education and Recreation, U. of A.	Member, joint City/U of A committee.
Ross Macnab	Associate Dean, U. of A.	Member, joint City/U of A committee.
Mel Poole	Associate V.P. Finance U. of A.	Member, joint City/U of A committee.
Dan Kanashiro	Investment Officer, U. of A.	Member, joint City/U of A committee.
Myer Horowitz	President, U. of A.	Member, joint City/U of A committee. Gain support of Board of Governors. Contacted Provincial government for support.
Jim Horseman	Minister, Advanced Education and Manpower	Supplied solicited support.
Peter Trenchy	Minister, Recreation and Parks	Supplied solicited support.
Peter Lougheed	Premier of Alberta	Supplied solicited support.
Mary LeMesseurier	Minister of Culture	Supplied solicited support.
Gerald Regan	Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport, Ottawa	Provided solicited support.
Steve Paproski	Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport, Ottawa	Provided solicited support.
Iona Campagnola	Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport, Ottawa	Provided solicited support.

This concerted effort between the city and the university was orchestrated by Cec Purves (Mayor of Edmonton) and Myer Horowitz (President of the University). In an effort to develop a suitable proposal and to ensure that both organizations would receive equal benefits, each man appointed a number of representatives to a joint-committee. The committee members were responsible, not only for developing a proposal and for contacting people for support, but also for advising their formal authority (i.e., the mayor, or the president). The mayor and the president in turn would make their recommendations to the City Council and to the University of Alberta Board of Governors.

In addition, the mayor and the president were responsible for contacting national and provincial ministers. Purves contacted the ministers responsible for sport at the national level, and Horowitz contacted the ministers responsible for sport, culture, and higher education at the provincial level.

Getting the formal support of both the provincial government and the federal government was important. Without provincial support, city council would not, and could not, host the event. This promise of monetary support was supplied by Jim Horseman (Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower), Peter Trenchy (Minister of Parks and Recreation), Mary Lemesseurier (Minister of Culture) and Peter Lougheed (Premier of Alberta).

As the city was dependent upon the province, so also was the province dependent upon the monetary support from the federal government. The province would agree to support the event only if the federal government would do the same. This support was in terms of agreeing to pay one third the cost of hosting the event.

There were three people at the national level recognized as providing formal support. Initially, Iona Campagnola was approached and had agreed to lend her support to the cause. There was a change in government, and Progressive Conservative Steve Paproski then became the Minister responsible for Sport and Recreation. However, he had agreed to take over where Campagnola left off. A second change in government again disrupted proceedings. Liberal Gerald Reagan then became responsible for the decision. Fortunately he also agreed to support the event.

Comparison of Powerful People to Test Hypothesis

Upon a comparison of the lists of powerful people only two names (Ed Zemrau and Premier Lougheed) appear on both. The extent of overlap between the events as determined by this decisional method provides no support for the existence of an elite power structure which exists over time. The extent of overlap is (2+2)÷(16+21) X 100 = 10.8% (an overlap of 2 out of 16 and an overlap of 2 out of 21).

9

Although there is only an overlap of two individuals, there is a greater degree of overlap between the positions which people hold in each event. The positions which overlap (besides the positions held by Zemrau and Lougheed) in clude, the mayor, dean of the physical education faculty, and two provincial portfolios.

The method identifies only those people who were involved in committees and those who were in the public eye trying to gain public support. Only people involved in an active and overt manner were recognized. The scope of this method is severely limited. Not all of what occurs (eg. informal discussions and meetings) becomes documented. As well, the interplay between participants and non-participants is not subject to analysis either. Therefore people who may be powerful in a covert manner are not identified.

Manifest Content Analysis of Number of Nominations

A form of manifest content analysis (Babbie 1973) was used to analyze the roles individuals were nominated to have fulfilled. The different roles mentioned by respondents were divided into six categories (based upon categories of behaviour developed by Presthus 1974, p. 59). If a person was nominated at least twice by respondents then that person was considered powerful.

The categories used for the analysis were:

1. Organizing people and duties - The person or persons who initiate the ideas and organize support. This includes the allocation of duties and responsibilities and the initial contacting of persons and groups.
2. Liaison - The person provides an affiliation or connection with another person, group or organization. A person uses connections with outside people or groups to enlist their support for the issue.
3. Provision of advice and expertise - Some people influence the decisions of others through their advice and recommendations. This influence is based on the recognition of their knowledge and capabilities.
4. Providing authorization - Use of position in an organization to provide formal support in the form of funds or consent.
5. Preparing Documentation - This category enlists all of the purely technical work. Such work includes feasibility studies, budgeting, planning, and the drafting of the booklets presented to council, and the national bodies (i.e., federal government, C.I.A.U. and Canadian Commonwealth Association).

6. Opposition - This includes all actions taken by persons or groups to defeat the proposal.

Each event was analyzed in the same manner. The people who were nominated as powerful were then compared to determine the extent of overlap.

Commonwealth Games

The information obtained in the interviews was analyzed according to the roles individuals were perceived to play. All of the people who were mentioned in the interviews, along with their subsequent roles and positions (at the time of the event), were listed in (Table VIII). The individuals were listed according to the number of nominations they received (i.e., greatest amount to least amount).

A total of 28 people received nominations for participating in the initial stage. However, only 16 people received 2 or more nominations. According to this method, these 16 people are considered powerful. The 12 people receiving 1 nomination are not considered to be powerful.

Upon an examination of table VIII, three fairly distinct groups can be discerned. The first group consists of 3 people with nominations varying from 10 to 14. These people include Alek Romaniuk, Ivor Dent and Hal Pawson. The next group includes Dave Ward, Maury Van Vliet and Ed Zemrau. They received between 7 and 8 nominations each. The

Table VIII

MANIFEST CONTENT ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

INDIVIDUALS NOMINATED AS POWERFUL THROUGH NUMBER OF NOMINATIONS

NAME	POSITION	CATEGORIES AND NUMBER OF NOMINATIONS FOR EACH ROLE						TOTAL
		ORGANIZING PEOPLE & DUTIES	LIAISON	PROVISION OF ADVICE & EXPERTISE	PROVIDING AUTHORIZATION	TECHNICAL	OPPOSITION	
Alex Romaniuk	School Prin. Pres. of CAWA	9	2	3				14
Ivor Dent	Mayor	8			5			13
Hal Pawson	Public Relations City of Edmonton	5	2	3				10
Dave Ward	Alderman	4	2		2			8
Maury Van Vliet	Dean of Phys. Ed. U of A		3		4			7
Ed Zemrau	Director of Athletics U of A	2	1	2		2		7
Ron Hayter	Alderman			1	4			5
Ed Leger	Alderman						5	5
Alex Fallow	Alderman		1	2	1			4
Col. J. Davies	Pres. Canadian Commonwealth Assoc.			2	2			4
Horst Schmid	Provincial Min.				4			4
Una McLean Evans	Alderman		1		2			3
Bert Hohol	Provincial Min.		1		2			3
Derek Riley	Parks Planner					3		3
Ron Ferguson	Parks Planner					3		3
Ted Peterson	Fitness & Amateur Sport		1	1				2
Al Niels	Businessman		1					1
Jim Hole	Businessman		1					1
Al Adair	Provincial Min.				1			1
Terry Cavanaugh	Alderman				1			1
Julia Kiniski	Alderwoman				1			1
Ches Tanner	Alderman				1			1
Bill McLean	Alderman				1			1
Ross McBain	Businessman		1					1
Bernie Stanton	Businessman		1					1
Zane Feldman	Businessman		1					1
Peter Lougheed	Premier				1			1
George Hughes	City Commissioner					1		1

last group includes those people receiving between 2 and 5 nominations. Included in this group are Ron Hayter, Alex Fallow, Col. Jack Davies, Horst Schmid, Una McLean Evans, Bert Hohol, Ed Leger, Derek Riley, Ron Ferguson, and Ted Peterson.

Although all of the people with 2 nominations are considered powerful there are some relative differences. The people belonging to the first group are considered (according to this methodology) to be relatively more powerful than the other two groups. Again, relatively speaking, the second group is considered to be more powerful than the third.

University Games

For the second event thirty-seven people received nominations for participating in the initial stage in a significant manner. These people along with their roles and positions were listed in (Table IX). Once their roles were categorized 31 people were identified as powerful. Six people had only one nomination.

Five people were identified as being much more powerful than the rest of the individuals. They include Myer Horowitz, Ed Zemrau, Ron Ferguson, Herb McLachlin and Cec Purves. The next closest group received a third to a half

TABLE IX

MANIFEST CONTENT ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS

INDIVIDUALS NOMINATED AS POWERFUL THROUGH NUMBER OF NOMINATIONS

UNIVERSITY GAMES

NAME	POSITION	CATEGORIES AND NUMBER OF NOMINATIONS FOR EACH ROLE						TOTAL
		ORGANIZING PEOPLE & DUTIES	LIAISON	PROVISION OF ADVICE & EXPERTISE	PROVIDING AUTHORIZATION	TECHNICAL	OPPOSITION	
Ed Zemrau	Director of Athletic Serv.	5	4	5		7		21
Myer Horowitz	Pres. U. of A.	9	1		5			15
Cec Purves	Mayor	9			4			13
Ron Ferguson	Special Events							11
	Co-ordinator (City)			2		9		
Herb McLachlin	Dean of Phy. Ed.		1	1		9		11
Ross Macnab	Associate Dean		2			9		11
Mel Poole	Associate V.P.			1		7		8
	Finance U. of A.				1			
Alf Savage	Commissioner					7		8
Jim Armstrong	Parks Planner				7			7
Peter Lougheed	Premier				3			7
John Schlosser	Chairman Board		3	3	2			6
	of Governors		3		5			
Max Beretti	Board of Governors				5			5
Jim Horseman	Provincial Min,				1	4		5
Peter Trenchy	Provincial Min.				4			5
Doug Burrows	Chief Commissioner					4		4
Mary Lemessurier	Provincial Min.					4		4
Ron Hayter	Alderman		2		1			3
Dan Kanashiro	Investment Officer					3		3
Hugh Monroe	Superintent Parks					3		3
Jan Connors	Parks Planner					3		3
Ed Leger	Alderman						3	3
Al Adair	Provincial Min.				3			3
Steve Paproski	Federal Min.				3			3
Gerald Regan	Federal Min.				3			3
Iona Campagnola	Federal Min.				3			2
Maury Van Vliet	Retired			2				2
Alex Fallow	Businessman			2				2
Ron Phillips	V.P. of Facilities					2		2
Directors of Sports Canada							2	2
Pierre Trudeau	Prime Min.				2			2
Percy Wickman	Alderman		1					2
Al Ward	Provincial Min.		1					1
Bob Pery	Executive Member C.I.A.U.		1					1
Lorne Leitch	V.P. of Finance U of A				1			1
Betty Hewes	Alderwoman				1			1
Lois Campbell	Alderwoman				1			1
Joanne Monroe	News Reporter			1				1

as many nominations (6 to 8 nominations). The people belonging to this group include Peter Lougheed, John Schlosser, Mel Poole, Alf Savage, Max Beretti, Jim Armstrong, Jim Horseman and Peter Trenchy. The remaining people received only a few nominations, half as many as the second group.

According to the differentiation between the nominations some people are identified as being definitely more powerful than others.

Comparison of Powerful People

Upon a comparison of the two events, 7 individuals (Ron Ferguson, Ed Zemrau, Peter Lougheed, Ed Leger, Ron Hayter, Maury Van Vliet and Alex Fallow) appear to be powerful on both lists. There is one individual, Al Adair, who appears to be powerful on the second list but not on the first. These 7 individuals produce an overlap of 21.5% $[(7+7)\div(28+37)\times100=21.5\%]$. Although this is a substantial increase in the extent of overlap compared to the first method, it still does not provide the support necessary to accept the hypothesis. The overlap, though greater than that produced in method 1, is still considerably less than 40%. Therefore it appears that the same power structure was not responsible for both events.

When the number of nominations for each person are compared, only one person (Ed Zemrau) received a relatively large number of nominations for each issue. However, Peter Lougheed, Ron Ferguson and Maury Van Vliet received a relatively large number of nominations in one issue but not in another. The rest of the people (Fallow and Hayter) received a low number of nominations for each issue.

When the position of the powerful people are examined and compared, the extent of overlap increases considerably. The positions which tended to overlap were, the mayor, the dean of physical education, athletic director for physical education, the premier, city planners, aldermanic positions and provincial ministerial positions. In the majority of cases, it appears the power exercised by people in these positions was based upon their position. For example, the aldermen and ministers had to make the decision to support or reject the games. They had no choice, they were obligated to participate because of their formal responsibility. This is confirmed by the location of the majority of their nominations appearing in the formal authorization category.

As with the first methodology, the analysis of nominations tended to identify those persons who overtly exercised their power. Individuals who were more active in an issue tended to have a higher profile. Through their involvement and efforts to gain support they had come into contact with many people. It is very possible that the number of nominations people receive measure public visibility rather than provide an accurate measurement of their relative power and their contribution to the outcome of the issue.

Individuals involved in a less active or covert manner, would not receive many nominations. Few people would be aware of that person's contributions to the outcome of the decision. This reputational method did not take into consideration, the 'negative' aspect of power or the covert use of it.

Latent Content Analysis of Interviews

In this method of analysis, the sequence of events was reconstructed to reveal the interaction, or interplay, between individuals. The intent of this was to reveal not only the patterns of overt influence, but also to reveal the patterns of covert influence. The contributions of people who have affected the issue in a covert or passive manner, have not been considered by previous methods.

People were identified as powerful based upon a subjective judgement of the importance of their contribution to the outcome of the issue. The importance of a person's input was determined by examining the context and the emphasis of statements made by respondents. This is a form of latent content analysis (Babbie 1973).

Identification of Powerful People and the Commonwealth Games

An analysis of the interviews reveals that only a few of the people identified in the second methodology could be considered powerful. Not everybody's input was of equal consequence. A number of people identified earlier were judged to be merely 'go-betweens' and 'leg men' (fulfilling instructions). The people in table X however, were still identified as being powerful.

Table X Powerful Individuals Identified by Latent Content Analysis of Interviews

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

NAME	POSITION DURING INITIATION STAGE	KEY INFLUENTIAL
Alex Romaniuk	School Principal President of Canadian Amateur Wrestling Association	*
Ivor Dent	Mayor of Edmonton	*
Col. Jack Davies	Chairman of Site Selection Committee	*
Ron Hayter	Alderman	*
Maury Van Vliet	Dean, Faculty of Physical Education	*
Ed Zemrau	Director of Athletics, University of Alberta	
Ted Peterson	Executive National Sport and Fitness	*
Peter Lougheed	Premier	*
Bert Hohol	Provincial Minister	
Dave Ward	Alderman	*
Alex Fallow	Alderman	*
Al Neils	Businessman	*
Jim Hole	Businessman	*
Una McLean Evans	Alderman	
Al Adair	Provincial Minister	

* Relatively more powerful than the others.

Reconstruction of Events: Commonwealth Games

Of all the people identified in the initial stge, Alek Romaniuk was unquestionably the most influential figure. He was unanimously accredited by many respondents "as being the person to initiate the idea for bringing the Games to Edmonton." During a meeting of the Canadian Amateur Sports Association in January 1969, Mr. Romaniuk met with Col. Jack Davies, the president of the Commonwealth Games Association of Canada, and "discussed the possibility of bringing the Games to Edmonton." Upon his return to Edmonton, Mr. Romaniuk "took the matter up with Ed Zemrau," who at the time was the Director of Athletics at the University of Alberta. The two men had worked together earlier to bring the World Amateur Wrestling Champsionship to Edmonton in 1970. Dr. Van Vliet, Dean of the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation, was also contacted to discuss the proposal. These three men formed a steering committee to study the feasibility of bringing the Games to Edmonton and to gather support from other Edmontonians. Dr. Van Vliet's support was "essential for obtaining the permission to use the University's facilities." As well, his support was needed to help Mr. Romaniuk convince the Mayor to support the issue.

Mr. Romaniuk contacted Mayor Dent in early 1969, but the Mayor was "indisposed and sent Hal Pawson" (the City's

Public Relations Director) to represent him in the discussions. This increased the number of the steering committee to four. Several respondents replied that Mayor Dent "was very reluctant to provide any support and to officially sanction the proposal." Despite the Mayor's lack of support, the steering committee proceeded to send a formal proposal to Col. Davies on December 1, 1969. This was the deadline by which all applications for hosting the Games had to be submitted. Col. Davies replied "that the submission must come from the City." In order to formalize the bid, the Mayor had to submit it to the Site Selection Committee for the Games. At the "urging of the steering committee" and "a request by Col. Davies to submit a formal bid," Mayor Dent finally sent one away on the 18th of December.

Getting the Mayor to support the proposal was only the first step in securing the bid. Mr. Romaniuk was also instrumental in gaining support from the provincial government and the support of the Site Selection Committee for the Commonwealth Games. He was able to gain the support of these groups through "personal contacts in each organization." At the provincial level, Bert Hohol was accredited with giving Romaniuk a "lot of support." As Minister of the Department of Manpower and Labour, he was perceived to "carry a lot of weight." He had talked to several people in the provincial government to help support Edmonton's bid for the Games. Horst Schmid, then Minister of Culture fulfilled basically a 'ministerial' function. The bid fell under his jurisdiction and was therefore obligated to become involved. One respondent even said "Mr. Hohol recruited the support of Mr. Schmid." Hohol is thus considered to be influential in a covert manner. He had provided support in an informal non-public manner.

At the provincial level, Premier Lougheed was another person who contributed to the issue. He did not become actively involved in the support of the issue. One person commented "we didn't bother him, we just knew he would be supportive". Even though he was not actively involved, he still influenced the actions and perceptions of other people involved. Supporters of the issues perceived they had the "assured support" of the premier and functioned according to this premise.

Similarly, Al Adair, Minister of Recreation, was another person perceived as a "real sports enthusiast." He was called "Boomer" by friends and acquaintances and was treated as being a "real supporter" of athletics. He was very adament in his support of the issue and provided a lot of support in a covert manner.

Mayor Dent was another leading figure in the initial stage. Almost everyone interviewed indicated he was very significant and "if it wasn't for him, Edmonton would not have got the Games." Although Dent's involvement was critical, the above statement is not entirely true. Essentially he made three major contributions to the outcome of the issue. Firstly, his endorsement was needed to formalize the bid. Secondly, he manoeuvered the bid through City Council, and finally he helped present it to the Site Selection Committee.

In the first instance, Mayor Dent was very reluctant to support the bid because as one person commented, "he could not see how we could go for such an event." Only through the persuasion and advice of other people did he finally send the letter. The bid was submitted late because he had delayed his support. Even when Romaniuk had invited Col. Davies to Edmonton to see the facilities, Dent was still reluctant to assist in escorting the president. In fact, according to a couple of sources, Dent was supposed to formally invite Davies but had "failed to do so." Two respondents revealed that it was alderman Dave Ward who took the initiative and sent a formal invitation.

Dent did finally become enthused with the idea of hosting the Games. Soon after Col. Davies' visit in May of 1970 the Canadian government decided it would not allow the Canadian Association to bid for the Games. A year later the decision was reversed. Edmonton had only two months with which to prepare a bid, and pass it through Council. Some time during this period Dent had changed his mind and decided to "go for the Games." This change was a result of the "advice and support" he received from such people as Jim Hole, an executive member of the Eskimo Football-Club, E.S. Neils, Vice President of Molson's Western Breweries Ltd. and from councillors such as Alex Fallow, Ron Hayter and Dave Ward. All of these men were heavily involved in different amateur sports. Two respondents believed that because there was support from the business community and from people on council, "Dent felt very secure and decided to support the bid."

With regards to manoeuvering the proposal through City Council, Dent very astutely used his authority to bias the outcome of City Council's decision.* He accomplished this in three steps. George Hughes, Commissioner of the Public Affairs, was directed to arrange all of the necessary administrative support and documentation. Then four councillors, who were considered to be "sympathetic towards the proposal" were appointed to the Public Affairs Committee to review the bid and make recommendations to Council. Finally, the agenda of the next council meeting was rearranged to include a discussion of the proposal.

* BACHRACH and BARATZ (1970) refer to this as mobilization of bias.

Dent had to "move quickly," because Edmonton's submission had to be ready for a December meeting of the Site Selection Committee in Montreal. This left him two months to get a proposal prepared and approved by Council. Hal Pawson was appointed to "head up a committee" to prepare the bid. Two respondents revealed that "arrangements were made with George Hughes, the Commissioner of Public Affairs, to have Ron Furgeson and Rod Meade assist Pawson in the preparation of the document." In addition "he directed Commissioner Hughes and other members of the civic administration to provide all the necessary information and to assist the group in any way."

Once the proposal was finished, it had to be reviewed by a committee representing Council. Dent "appointed four councillors who were very supportive of the ideas of bringing the Games to Edmonton, to the committee." This committee included, Una McLean Evans, Ron Hayter, Ches Tanner and Terry Cavanaugh. Three respondents reported that in its report to Council, "the committee highly recommended the proposal be accepted."

The last problem to overcome was getting the issue on City Council's agenda before December. Some persons in the civic administration revealed that Dent used his authority to "rearrange the agenda and add the issue to the next Council meeting." When the issue came up in Council, sixteen of the seventeen recommendations were approved by Council. Dave Ward moved to amend one of the recommendations. He proposed to build a major 40,000 seat structure instead of the original 15,000 seat stadium. He convinced Council that "a stadium of this size had many benefits, plus two thirds of the cost would be picked up by the provincial and federal governments." The motion was supported by a majority and passed. The entire proposal was approved by Council on November 29, 1971.

Dave Ward proved to be very significant. Basically, he made some important contributions during some critical moments in the early stage. In the first instance, Col. Davies was "informally" invited to Edmonton by Romaniuk in order to view the facilities and to secure his support. An official invitation was to be sent to him by the Mayor with the signature of the Premier. Davies was scheduled to visit Edmonton in May of 1970, but no invitation went out to him until shortly before he was to arrive. Dent had neglected to send the letter, so in his place, Ward sent an official invitation on City letterhead. One particular respondent stated that "Col. Davies was quite proper and he would not come to Edmonton unless formally invited." If this situation would not have worked out, as one respondent pointed out, "Davies may not have supported Edmonton at all." This could have resulted in the loss of the bid.

Ward was also very instrumental in obtaining support from other councillors. He was considered to be a "strong voice on council." In particular, he convinced council to approve an amendment he introduced concerning the development of a 40,000 seat stadium.

Ward also had a hand in averting another potentially damaging situation. Alderman Ed Leger sent a letter to Col. Davies just before the site selection meeting. He warned Davies that the "City's bid was too costly and it was forcing many persons to oppose the entire application." Ward sent a letter soon afterwards explaining it was "Leger who was opposed and not the rest of Council and that there was a lot of support from the business sector and from the community." Had Leger's letter been accepted by Davies and other members on the selection committee as fact, Edmonton's chances of being selected would have been slim.

Ward's actions during critical moments in the initial stage of the event proved to be very significant in the final outcome. In many instances, he took the initiative and contributed more than was required of an alderman.

Ed Zemrau had been nominated by several people, the majority of whom stated that "he was significant through his involvement with the steering committee." Zemrau is considered to be significant, not because of his overt involvement in the steering committee, but because of his covert involvement before the committee was formed "in working around Van Vliet and getting him interested" and obtaining the use of the University's facilities.

For the most part after acquiring the support of Van Vliet and the University, Zemrau's contributions to the issue consisted of mainly "contacting sport's committees from other countries for their support." This contribution was not considered to be very significant.

Dr. Maury Van Vliet was another person who made important contributions to the issue. Respondents believed that he would be able to convince the University to let the City use a number of its facilities (e.g., Lister Hall Housing Complex, the gymnasium and the arena). In particular, one respondent said that "we got assurance from Van Vliet that we could use the university stadium."

Acquiring Van Vliet's support at the beginning of the issue was very advantageous in another way as well. Essentially, the Dean added his prestige to the steering committee. His prestige stems from being the "Dean of one of the foremost schools of physical education in North America." His added support gave the committee, and the idea of hosting the Games, the credibility it needed to be seriously considered by businessmen and politicans. Beyond these two major contributions, the only other thing Van Vliet was noted for was his presentation at the meeting in

Montreal. However, after Canada was selected over England to host the Games, Van Vliet became progressively more involved.

Aldermen Alex Fallow and Ron Hayter were mentioned earlier as having some influence over Mayor Dent. Several comments made by respondents support this statement. One person stated that "Dent relied heavily upon their advice" and another stated "Fallow, in particular, was one person that I would go to." With the advice and support of Fallow and Hayter and with the "urging of Ward," Dent was "reassured that the games would be good for Edmonton."

The other persons considered to be powerful and influential are Jim Hole and E.S. Niels. Of the business sector, these two men were considered to be influential in the initial stage. Jim Hole, an executive and later president of the Eskimo Football Club, was approached by Dent for advice. At the time, the Eskimos were looking for a means to enlarge Clarke Stadium or build a new stadium to accommodate more fans. Hole and the Eskimos were very supportive of the proposal because it meant the development of a larger stadium.

A few sources also stated "the Eskimos have tremendous political support." The fact that the Eskimos were perceived to have a lot of political support and that Dent went to Hole for "various bits of advice and assistance and so on", indicated the Eskimo's representative was influential.

The club even gave financial support to help send the committee to Munich to win the bid for Canada. The Eskimos were very intent on getting the stadium, rather than the Games themselves. In any case, they helped convince Dent and Council to approve the bid.

Hole was not only connected to the Eskimos, he was also very involved in a variety of businesses and organizations. Due to his reputation and connections, one source stressed that "he was a man to talk to in order to get support from the business sector."

E.S. Niels was another business figure who was mentioned by a couple of respondents. At a very early stage, Niels was prepared to support Romaniuk. Romaniuk had approached Niels and asked for his support. In an event of this nature, people or organizations with money are needed to provide some sort of credibility to the idea and to guide the way for other supporters. For example, Presthus (1964, p. 54 and p. 116) found "that the actions of one or a few prestigeful men in lending their names and their support to a project is usually a critical element in this 'take-off stage'." Once this support is given to a project support from other sources broadens. This was the case for Van Vliet, Hole and Niels. They each supported the idea and by lending their name to it, gave some credibility which influenced other sources to follow.

As with Hole, Niels also held some very prestigious positions in the community. Some of his positions included Vice-president of Molsons Western Breweries Ltd., Alberta Chairman of the Canadian Fund Raising Committee for the 1970 British Commonwealth Games, Alberta's member-at-large for the Commonwealth Games Assocation, Director of the Edmonton Exhibition Association, and the Chairman of the Edmonton United Community Fund Company and Employee Division. Due to his many positions and different involvements (he belonged to a long list of business, athletic and fraternal organizations in Edmonton), he was possibly very influential in eliciting the support of the business community.

One of the organizations Niels was involved with, the Edmonton Exhibition Assocation, donated $10,000 towards securing the bid. This type of support was needed to influence the provincial and city governments to also provide needed funds for the expenses of the committees involved with presenting the bid to the national and international associations.

Identification of Powerful People and the University Games

Roughly about half of the people nominated as powerful in the second method, were also identified as powerful in this third method. The inclusion of the measurement of covert and passive influence again reveals different patterns of influence. Some individuals considered powerful in the other methods were not considered powerful in this method, and vice versa. Those who were identified as powerful were listed in (Table XI).

Table XI Powerful People Identified Through A Latent Content Analysis of Interviews

University Games

NAME	POSITION DURING INITIATION STAGE	KEY INFLUENTIAL
Cec Purves	Mayor of Edmonton	*
Ron Hayter	Alderman	*
Myer Horowitz	President of University of Alberta	*
Ed Zemrau	Director of Athletics, University of Alberta	
Herb McLachlin	Dean of Faculty of Physical Education	*
Ross Macnab	Associate Dean of Physical Education	*
Mel Poole	Associate of Finance, U of A.	*
John Schlosser	Chairman, Board of Governors U of A.	*
Max Beretti	Board of Governors	*
Peter Lougheed	Premier	*
Pierre Trudeau	Prime Minister	*
Maury Van Vliet	Retired	
Alex Fallow	Businessman	
Al Adair	Provincial Minister	

* Relatively more powerful than the others.

Reconstruction of Events: University Games

The initial idea for bringing this event to Edmonton was shared between three people, Mayor Purves, Alderman Hayter and Ed Zemrau. Mayor Purves and Alderman Hayter wanted to attract another major sporting event to Edmonton. Hayter spearheaded a committee to examine various major sporting events and the feasibility of hosting one. Some members of the city administration were directed to study the problem. The process was put into motion, but it was lacking direction. That direction was supplied by Ed Zemrau, the Athletic Director at the University of Alberta. Upon hearing about the study the City was undertaking, Zemrau approached Purves to discuss the possibilities of hosting the University Games. A preliminary study was done on the Games, and it was found "the University Games could be accommodated by Edmonton at a relatively small cost." The facilities from the Commonwealth Games would be utilized, thus only leaving a small cost of 8 to 10 million dollars.

Soon after the Commonwealth Games were finished, some people at City Hall started to look for another event. Edmonton received favourable international exposure, a large amount of money exchanged hands during the event (i.e. stimulated spending), jobs were created and it precipitated a concerted community effort to run the events. Essentially, the Games boosted Edmonton's reputation and as one respondent said, "put them on the sports map."

Mayor Purves and other people at City Hall believed that another sporting event could duplicate the benefits experienced in the earlier event. One respondent from the City said, "after five years it would be a good time that we did something like that again." City Hall felt "Edmonton's international exposure needed a boost and the University Games would supply the exposure."

For the previous event, the support of City Council was very necessary. In this case, not only was the support of City Council needed, but the support of the University was essential as well. City Hall had the ability to finance the Student Games, but as one respondent said, "the University had to sanction them". It was therefore essential that the city obtain the support of the University. Thus, a coalition between the City and the University had to be formed to obtain the event.

The coalition did not have a good start. A conflict arose with the University when Purves announced to the press the City would bid for the 1981 University Games if the University was in agreement. Except for some informal discussions with the University's athletic director Ed Zemrau, the University had not been contacted. The announcement was made June 11, 1979. A decision had to be reached by August 1, 1979, because this was the application deadline for any Canadian city wishing to bid on the 1971 event. When the press contacted University President, Horowitz, he said "the University had not been contacted and they had no intention of bidding for the 1981 games."

When Horowitz first found out about the proposal it was four days after the Mayor's announcement in the paper. At this time the President asked Herb McLachlin, the Dean of the Physical Education and Recreation Faculty to report if the faculty was prepared to host the games. The Dean stated that "he did not know very much but he would find out." Horowitz indicated the University would not be involved in the 1981 Games. As for the 1983 Games, "before any commitment could be made a lot of questions had to be answered."

In the first week in July the Mayor invited the President to meet with him and discuss the matter. This was the first formal meeting between the City and University. At this meeting Horowitz indicated that "before any definite commitment could be made a few conditions must first be met." "A clear statement of support" had to be obtained from the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation indicating they were supportive and interested in becoming involved. Dean Herb McLachlin was asked to put the matter before his faculty to get an indication of support. In addition, another group of people from the University who had to be consulted and supportive, were the Board of Governors.

They had to be convinced the Games would be good for the University.

Another major concern for Horowitz was the role the University would play in the bid. Horowitz wanted a guarantee from Purves that the University would function as an equal partner with regards to planning and facilities. To accommodate an equal partnership and to obtain more information to convince the University to support the bid a joint committee was established. This group was comprised of representatives from the City and the University, and it was to answer to both the Mayor and the President. Several people involved in the committee stated that some initial planning was to be done" even in the absence of a clear indication of support from the physical education faculty."

A number of individuals were assigned by Horowitz and Purves to sit on a joint committee for planning the Games. The membership of this committee fluctuated somewhat but the group remained small and worked closely the whole time it was in existence. Representatives from the University included, Ed Zemrau (Director of Athletic Services), Ross Macnab (Asociate Dean), Herb McLachlin (Dean) and Mel Poole (Associate Vice-president of Finance and Administration). Dan Kanashiro (University Investment Officer) replaced Poole when he left the University. Another person, Ron Phillips (Vice-president of Facilities) periodically sat with the committee. The City was represented mainly by Ron Ferguson (Special Events Co-ordinator for Edmonton), Jim Armstrong (Planner with Recreation Department), Hugh Munroe (Manager of Recreation) and Alf Savage (City Commissioner of Public Affairs).

All of the people from the joint committee who were interviewed, commented that both sides were very cooperative and worked well together. The committee met on a regular basis and reported all developments to the President and the Mayor. Each of the members of the committee were assigned particular duties, including the Mayor and the President. They, in particular, had to approach the provincial and national governments for support. Horowitz corresponded with the provincial government while Purves talked to the federal government.

Although there were very few people participating up to this point, even fewer have been analyzed as powerful or influential. The direction and impetus had come mainly from a few people: Myer Horowitz and Ces Purves were considered to be the most powerful people in the issue. Several respondents stressed the importance of each man. One respondent was impressed with the way they created a "good working atmosphere by overriding customary bureaucratic practices and assigning a variety of resource people to work on the problem." Others indicated that "the two real backers were the mayor and Myer Horowitz" and that Horowitz was a "primary figure." As well, it was a "personal project of the mayor."

Besides being powerful as a result of their position, both men were also personally very influential. In particular, Horowitz had to gain the support of the Board of Governors, the Province and even ~~the Canadian~~ Intercollegiate Athletic Union (CIAU). He was considered to have been "extremely tactful and successful - when it came to the CIAU for support - and obtaining support from the provincial government." He managed to convince members of the Board of Governors and other faculty representatives to support the idea of hosting the Games. Some faculty members from the University were opposed to the idea of seeing an increase in the physical education facilities. They said other facilities had priority and should be considered first.

In dealing with the provincial government, the President was able to get the support of the Honourable Jim Horseman, Minister of Advanced Education and the Honorable Peter Trenchy, Minister of Sport and Recreation. Premier Lougheed was contacted first by Horowitz, but he was "advised to work directly with the ministers of education and sport." The Premier indicated "he was supportive of the issue but would provide formal support at the appropriate time." With regards to gaining the support of the CIAU, Horowitz talked to an old friend, Bob Perv, who happened to be an executive officer. He also contacted the President of the CIAU, Elizabeth Chard, and asked for her support.

Mayor Purves was influential in getting City Council to support the games. He talked to a number of alderman and explained to them that the games would recapture many of the advantages the City experienced during the Commonwealth Games (eg. facilities, stimulate spending, enhance amateur sport). Purves was also able to influence Council's decision by manipulating the information council received from the administration. A small committee appointed by Purves, made recommendations which were favourable to the issue. A few respondents revealed that the appointed commissioners were "fully in support and took a personal interest." In addition, one informed individual commented further on the commissioners, "any reports that went to council, first had to go through the commission board and were endorsed by the commission board first." Upon reviewing the information provided by the committee, Council acquired a more favourable view towards the proposal. Without this favourable information, Council might have been less supportive.

Another key person whose contributions were very significant was Ed Zemrau. He was recognized as being responsible for initiating the idea of bringing the University

Games to Edmonton. A number of comments identifying him as the initiator of the idea include; "prime pusher for the universiade", "primary initiative came from Zemrau" and "Zemrau providing the initial spark."

The City was already looking for another major sporting event but it was Zemrau who convinced them to go for the University Games. Through his informal discussions with the Mayor and other people from the City administration, the University became implicated. Zemrau had indirectly forced the University into the issue. The City decided to go after the University Games and announced their intentions in the newspapers. A few people from the university stated that after the announcement in the newspaper the "University was put on the spot and had to make a decision." Prior to the announcement, many people at the University had not been contacted and had no knowledge of what was planned.

Zemrau's influence stems from his involvement and his position with the CIAU. In his capacity as President of the CIAU, he was able to convince the Mayor the Games would meet the criteria set by the City. These criteria include an event "international in scope," and "present facilities should be able to accommodate the event," it should "attract a lot of interest" and the City must have a "good opportunity to be awarded the event." The City's chances for being awarded the opportunity to represent Canada in the bid may have been greatly enhanced by the fact that Zemrau was CIAU President. Many of the respondents in the interview believed that Zemrau would be able to "influence the CIAU" in choosing Edmonton as the Canadian site for hosting the Games. In addition, he was also an executive member of the International University Sports Federation (FISU). This was also believed to be an asset which would favour Edmonton in the final selection to determine the host city.

Zemrau also proved to be an important member on the committee. Due to his involvement in the Commonwealth Games and with his knowledge of university games, he was also an "invaluable source of information." Committee members relied upon his "expertise".

Alderman Ron Hayter was also considered to be a key influential. Essentially, he was very influential in a covert manner in "creating the momentum at City Hall" to search for and host another major sporting event. One respondent indicted Hayter "spearheaded a move" to bring other sporting events to Edmonton. Soon after the Commonwealth Games were completed, he had convinced the Mayor to look for another event. As a result of this action a new administrative position was created to examine potential events. Ron Ferguson was appointed to be the Special Events Co-ordinator and his responsibility included the examination and evaluation of various events which could be hosted by

Edmonton. Hayter, with the agreement and support of Mayor Purves might possibly be the person responsible for setting the motion at City Hall in process.

With regards to the joint committee there are three other people from the University who proved influential. Dean McLachlin and Associate Dean Macnab managed to get the faculty to support the proposals. They also advised the University President that it would be advantageous to support the Games. The University would gain new facilities and receive national and international exposure. Their advice to the President was one major factor in influencing his decision to support the Games.

These men also discussed the advantages of the event with the Chairman of the Board of Governors, John Schlosser. They convinced him the University would greatly benefit from the Games. Several people agreed that Schlosser's support was vital because "the Board of Governors had to make the final decision" which would allow the University to bid for the Games. Furthermore, McLachlin contacted some "personal friends" at the provincial level to get their support. These personal friends happened to be Premier Lougheed and Al Ward, Minister of Telephones. He also contacted councillors Percy Wickman, Betty Hewes and Lois Campbell.

Mel Poole was also very important in influencing the President's decision to support the Games. Poole was considered to be influential because of his advice to the President, not for his work on the committee. Horowitz did not want to depend entirely upon the recommendations of the people from the physical education faculty because, "they were not exactly impartial." He needed the advice of a "disinterested party." Poole had agreed with McLachlin that the Games would be good for the University. He stated that "much would be gained at very little cost." Upon the advice of these three people (Macnab, McLachlin, and Poole) the President decided to support the issue.

The people on the committee representing the City did not contribute to the issue in the same way. Zemrau had convinced the Mayor that the University Games were ideal for the City of Edmonton, whereupon the Mayor then directed the city administration to work on the problem. People like Alf Savage, Ron Ferguson and Jim Armstrong, did not influence the Mayor and convince him to host the event. As stated by the Mayor, "there are no volunteers around here, you appoint - you give them a job to do." Instead, the Mayor used his authority and assigned people to do the job. Therefore, the city representatives on the committee were considered to be performing "leg men" duties. They just basically fulfilled the technical requirements.

The joint committee did not constitute the whole decision making structure. There were people outside of the committee who had contributed much to the success of the initial stage. These people included the Chairman of the University's Board of Governors, John Schlosser, another member of the Board, Max Beretti, Premier Lougheed and Prime Minister Trudeau. Without the support of these people, Edmonton would not have had the chance to compete internationally for the privilege of hosting the event.

John Schlosser was perceived, by several people from the University, to be "very influential" in convincing the Board of Governors to give their approval. As one respondent commented "as chairman of the Board, he has a lot of influence as to the way he would guide this and present it to the Board of Governors." Essentially he chaired the discussions in the board meetings and presented a strong case for the approval of the issue. In addition, Max Beretti was perceived by a few people to have "provided a lot of support" to Schlosser at these meetings. Both men were described as being very "enthusiastic" in their support. The Board approved the President's request to allow the University to bid for the Games and to negotiate with the City.

According to a careful analysis of data collected from four particular interviews, Lougheed was very instrumental in a covert manner in getting the provincial government to support the bid. It appears the Premier was contacted by people from the University before any of the ministers were. When at first the ministers were contacted, "their reaction was quite cool." Several comments alluded to the fact that "Lougheed changed their minds." The ministers "had looked to Lougheed for the final word." A possible reason why the government was not immediately supportive was because of plans to host the 1988 Winter Olympics. A lot of money was to be allocated to that event. As a result, the ministers were hesitant in giving their support which would require another major expenditure.

A similar occurrence was also evident at the national level. Sport Canada was not supportive at all for two reasons; 1) they said "the games were elitist" (university students only) and 2) "the budget would not accommodate a major expenditure of this sort." Representatives of the City then went to the minister responsible for sport and recreation, Steve Paproski. He gave his support but added that "it was his department that was supportive, and he would have to get the support of the rest of Clark's Conservative government." Unfortunately, the Conservatives lost power and the Liberals assumed control of the government. The City had to renegotiate for support from the new federal government. It appears through several comments, that Gerald Reagan, the new minister responsible for sport "was not too supportive" of the proposal. Representatives from the joint-committee had to go to the Prime Minister's office to get his approval. Despite Sport Canada's opposition to the idea and Reagan's lack of support (although he was not really against the event), Trudeau "basically overruled both the ministers and Sport Canada" and gave the committee the endorsement they asked for because "Edmonton is going to go ahead for the bid anyway". He wanted the Games to be a "Canadian event." The matter of funding was to be discussed at a later date. During the bid process, the committee was just asking for an endorsement from the federal government.

Without the support of Trudeau, the bid for the games might have been stalled three years before the event was to take place. The provincial government then would probably have withdrawn their support. The cost would be too high and the provincial government would not be able to justify such a large expenditure.

Three other people were considered to be somewhat significant to the outcome of the decision. Maury Van Vliet (retired by this time) "was asked for advice by the provincial government." They had asked him to become involved on a "volunteer basis in an advisory capacity." Alek Fallow was approached by the City to get his comments as to the chances of hosting such an event, and whether the business community would be supportive. In particular, Purves depended upon

Fallow and Van Vliet for advice. One respondent emphasized that "he (Purves) also discussed this matter with people like Alex Fallow and Maury Van Vliet." Finally, Al Adair, by now the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, was considered to be "invaluable in our efforts" by Zemrau. Zemrau may have gone to Adair to help gather support and to get the "ball rolling". Adair may have been used as an initial contact for several reasons; 1) he and Zemrau had worked together on the Commonwealth Games, 2) he was considered to be "a great sportsman" and 3) he would be able to influence a lot of people because of his position.

Although there are more people from the University considered to be powerful and influential than the City, this does not mean the University is more powerful. The difference is a result of different interaction patterns for each group. Purves and Horowitz each had different circumstances within which to operate.

Purves had not only prior experience but also different organizational constraints. Through his involvement with the Commonwealth Games, he knew what benefits the City would obtain by hosting another major sporting event. In addition, he knew what steps had to be taken to get the proposal started. Using his authority as chief executive, he assigned people from the city administration to work on the problem of finding an event Edmonton would be capable of hosting. After Hayter, the only other person to influence Purves at this stage was Zemrau. Although Purves wanted to host another event and took the steps to realize his goal, he did not know which event would be best. Zemrau was able to convince him that this event was an excellent choice.

Horowitz, however, was in an entirely different position. He was totally unprepared and needed advice as to the costs and benefits. In addition, he did not have the same authority as Purves. Each man was situated in a different organization with a different hierarchy of command. Horowitz could not committee the University at first because he could not answer for the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation or for the Board of Governors. Before he could, or even would, make a recommendation to the Board, Horowitz needed to know if the faculty was in favour and what the costs and benefits would be. Unlike Purves, Horowitz had no prior experience and thus did not know what to expect. Therefore, he had to rely on the advice of other people. This advice was supplied by McLachlin, Macnab and Poole. As well, he needed the support of the Board of Governors. This support was supplied by Schlosser and Beretti. Essentially, Purves did not have the same constraints as did Horowitz. This is the reason why there is an imbalance in the number of representatives from each group.

The driving force for the event originated at City Hall and was expanded through Ed Zemrau to the University and from the University up through the two levels of government. Within this driving force there was very little mention of people from the business sector or from the general community. These people were conspicuous in their absence. There was some mention of getting the support of the many sporting organizations, but it would seem rather that their support was assumed.

Comments concerning businessmen were examined very closely to understand how they may have affected the event. When respondents were asked if any businessmen were involved or supportive, many respondents replied that they couldn't think of anybody in particular but rather everybody who was contacted was supportive. It seems the people involved in the event took for granted the business sector would be in favour of the games because of all the money it would bring into Edmonton. Purves had sent letters to "different organizations like the Chamber of Commerce and athletic groups asking them for their support - had a pretty strong support base for it so he believed in what he was doing." It appears that community organizations and other taxpayers were not contacted. The response Purves received from these groups was to be a 'testing period'. The feedback from these organizations assured Purves that he had a strong base of support.

Purves' action represents a case of mobilization of bias, as discussed by Bachrach and Baratz (1970). The people who would most likely provide support were contacted and the people who may not have provided support were not contacted. In addition, he directed the commissioners who supplied council with their information. These actions would guarantee an outcome which would favour the issue. Opposition to the issue was not given a chance to form at this early stage.

One such group not contacted was the wider University community. Judging by the responses from people from the City, the University was very reluctant to provide support until they were assured that the new facilities would be built on campus. In a sense, the City bought the support of the University. This is apparent in one respondent's comments, the "the field house was not absolutely essential, it was essential in obtaining the support of the University, the University did not benefit much by the Commonwealth Games. They became more supportive when it found out that it was going to receive some concrete benefits." It is unclear why the University was not contacted at the time of the inception of the idea rather than after an announcement of the City's plans in the newspapers. This appears to be poor planning. If the City was positive the University would be supportive of this event why did they not include them at the start? The actions of the City pressured the University to make a quick decision. Only after offering the University millions of dollars worth of facilities, did the city secure their support.

Comparison of Powerful People to Test Hypothesis

The comparison of powerful people identified by this method produces a much greater overlap than the previous two methods. Although there are fewer names overlapping as compared to method two, the per cent of overlap is greater. Out of a list of fifteen (Commonwealth Games) and a list of fourteen (University Games) 6 people overlap. They include, Ed Zemrau, Peter Lougheed, Al Adair, Ron Hayter, Alex Fallow, and Maury Van Vliet. The extent of overlap in this case is $(6+6) \div (15+14) \times 100 = 41.3\%$.

The results from this analysis support the hypothesis. There is sufficient overlap to conclude that a persistent power structure responsible for obtaining both events existed in Edmonton.

Although the hypothesis was supported with a 41% overlap, the test was not totally conclusive. Four people (Al Adair, Ed Zemrau, Maury Van Vliet and Alex Fallow) were identified as key influentials in one issue but only as influential in the other. They were still considered to be powerful in the issue, but they were not as powerful or as influential as others in the same event. Only Ron Hayter and Peter Lougheed were considered to be key influentials in both issues.

It appears that the covert aspect of power cannot be separated or ignored in a study of power structures. With the inclusion of a method for the measurement of covert power, the patterns of influence change dramatically. For example, individuals identified as powerful in the third method (Al Neils, Ted Peterson, Peter Lougheed, Al Adair and Bert Hohol) received very few nominations in the second methods. As a result, they were not considered to be influential.

This occurs for people in both events as can be seen by comparing the data in (Table XII). Individuals identified as powerful in the first method were not considered powerful in the second or third methods. In particular Alf Savage, Ron Ferguson and Hugh Monroe met the criteria for the first method, but received few nominations in the second, and were not identified as contributing significantly to the outcome of the issue in the third method.

These results show that the people who were the most visible, and who were perceived by many to be powerful, were not as powerful as they had seemed.

Without information obtained in method three the patterns of influence would not include the passive and/or

Table XII

POWERFUL INDIVIDUALS IDENTIFIED BY THREE METHODS OF ANALYSIS

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

NAMES	1. Overt Exercise of Power from Documents	2. Influence Exerting Activity from Interviews	3. Overt and Covert Active and Passive Influence
Col. Jack Davies	Yes	4	Key influential
Alek Romaniuk	Yes	14	Key influential
Ivor Dent	Yes	13	Key influential
Una McLean Evans	Yes	3	Influential
Ron Hayter	Yes	5	Key influential
Terry Cavanaugh	Yes	1	No.
Ches Tanner	Yes	1	No.
Ed Zemrau	Yes	7	Influential
Maury Van Vliet	Yes	7	Key influential
Hal Pawson	Yes	10	No.
Ted Peterson	Yes	2	Key influential
Peter Lougheed	Yes	1	Key influential
Al Adair	Yes	1	Key influential
Horst Schmid	Yes	4	No.
Larry Healy	Yes	0	No.
Philip Rispin	Yes	0	No.
Dave Ward	Yes	8	Key influential
Ed Leger	No	5	No.
Alex Fallow	No	4	Key influential
Bert Hohol	No	3	Influential
Derek Riley	No	3	No.
Julia Kiniski	No	1	No.
Bill McLean	No	1	No.
Ron Ferguson	No	3	No.
Ross McBain	No	1	No.
Bernie Stanton	No	1	No.
Zane Feldman	No	1	No.
Al Niels	No	1	Key influential
Jim Hole	No	1	Key influential
George Hughes	No	1	No.

Table XII (cont'd)

POWERFUL INDIVIDUALS IDENTIFIED BY THREE METHODS OF ANALYSIS

UNIVERSITY GAMES

NAMES	1. Overt Exercise of Power from Documents	2. Influence Exerting Activity from Interviews	3. Overt and Covert Active and Passive Influence
Cec Purves	Yes	13	Key influential
Doug Burrows	Yes	5	No
Alf Savage	Yes	8	No
Hugh Munroe	Yes	4	No
Jim Armstrong	Yes	7	No
Ron Ferguson	Yes	11	No
Jan Connors	Yes	3	No
Ron Phillips	Yes	2	No
Ed Zemrau	Yes	21	Key influential
Herb McLachlin	Yes	11	Key influential
Ross Macnab	Yes	11	Key influential
Mel Poole	Yes	2	Key influential
Dan Kanishiro	Yes	4	No
Myer Horowitz	Yes	15	Key influential
Jim Horseman	Yes	5	No
Peter Trenchy	Yes	5	No
Peter Lougheed	Yes	7	Key influential
Mary Lemessurier	Yes	4	No
Gerald Regan	Yes	3	No
Steve Paproski	Yes	3	No
Iona Campagnola	Yes	3	No
John Schlosser	No	6	Key influential
Max Beretti	No	5	Key influential
Ed Leger	No	3	No
Al Adair	No	3	Key influential
Elizabeth Chard	No	3	No
Pierre Trudeau	No	2	Key influential
Ron Hayter	No	2	Key influential
Percy Wickman	No	2	No
Maury Van Vliet	No	2	Influential
Alex Fallow	No	2	Influential
Al Ward	No	1	No
Bob Perv	No	1	No
Lorne Leitch	No	1	No
Bettie Hewes	No	1	No
Lois Campbell	No	1	No
Joanne Monroe	No	1	No

covert holders of power. Only those people who were visibly and actively involved would be identified as power holders.

Projected Reputational Method

Respondents were asked to name those people they perceived would be essential in obtaining another major sporting event for Edmonton (e.g., Pan-Am Games). The responses to this question focussed upon the positions which would be required and upon particular characteristics which people would need. Names of particular people were not mentioned.

Although the responses varied, all of the respondents mentioned the positions which were vested with the formal authority for making decisions. These positions included, the mayor, aldermen, city administrators (planners, commissioners), premier, provincial ministers and prominent businessmen. Some of the respondents also included the prime minister, federal minister and national sport governing bodies.

All of the respondents stressed that all, or at least the majority of these positions were essential. In addition, the people in these positions had to be co-operative. Respondents tended to agree that a lack of support from one or more of these positions could disrupt the whole process.

In addition to the positions, respondents stressed the importance of different characteristics. Several respondents stressed "expertise" and "prominence in the community." Others indicated that people should be "well known," have a lot of "energy" and be "well organized." Still others suggested that "contacts" were essential. These were a few of the characteristics which were mentioned.

The positions and characteristics identified by respondents in this method were similar to the positions and characteristics identified in the other methods. There was one particular group of people who were involved in the two events but who were not identified in this method. This group consists of people from the University. Not one respondent mentioned a person in a university position. Even respondents from the University did not stress the need for university personnel.

Some of the roles of the people in these positions were also stressed by many respondents. These tended to be very similar to the roles which emerged in the previous events. For example respondents indicated that the "support of the mayor is essential" for obtaining the formal support of the municipal government. This was evident in the reconstruction of events. As indicated by several respondents "without the support of the mayor, the idea never had a chance" and "the mayor can support an issue or kill it."

The role of the civic administrators was also stressed. They are the people who do the "technical work and supply city hall with its information." The importance of committees composed of city commissioners and planners was identified in the previous methods. City council depended upon them for information from which to base their decisions.

With regards to the importance of prominent businessmen, this was also evident in methods 2 and 3. Their expertise and monetary support was identified as being important for the Commonwealth Games.

The support of the premier and provincial ministers was also stressed by many respondents. Some indicated that "events requiring large amounts of money require provincial and even federal backing." As discussed in the third method, the premier and even the prime minister played important roles.

The importance of the position was stressed in this fourth method, not the person who filled it. In fact, some of the respondents even stated that "it would be hard to say who would be essential, it depends upon who is in office at that time."

The evidence collected by this method does not supply support for the hypothesis. There were a number of overlapping positions, many of which were also identified as being essential in attracting future events. There were, however, few overlaps of particular people. In addition, none of the people identified in the study were identified as being essential for bringing future sporting events to Edmonton.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

A number of conclusions arise from the study. To facilitate a more orderly discussion of the various conclusions, this chapter is divided into four sections. The first section deals with conclusions concerning the methodologies used in the study. Following this is a discussion of the power structure in Edmonton. Third is an examination of the utility of this study (and of power studies in general) for the practitioner. The final section provides suggestions for further research.

Conclusions from Methodology

The results obtained from the different methods used in this study support the contention of other researchers that "reported findings may be artifacts of systematic disciplinary or methodologyical basis ..." (Walton in Aiken 1970, p. 450). Each method led to a different conclusion concerning the extent of overlap of influentials between events and the subsequent existence of a power structure related to major sporting events. This study revealed that different conclusions were obtained because each method measured, or identified, a different aspect of power.

In figure 2 the particular method of measurement was combined with the particular aspect of power upon which it focused.

FIGURE 2 Type of Power as Measured by a Particular Method

Affect on Outcome of Issue

		INFLUENTIAL	NON-INFLUENTIAL
Individual's Input Into Issue	Visible to Many	OVERTLY POWERFUL DECISIONAL ANALYSIS BASED UPON AN EXAMINATION OF DOCUMENTS (Method 1) MANIFEST CONTENT ANALYSIS OF THE NUMBER OF NOMINATIONS (Method 2) Cell 1	CEREMONIAL, FORMAL OR TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROJECTED REPUTATIONAL (Method 4) Cell 2
	Not Visible to Many	CONVERTLY POWERFUL LATENT CONTENT ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS (Method 3) Cell 3	COMMONER Cell 4

A number of disadvantages became apparent after using the first method (decisional analysis based upon an examination of documents) to measure power. The first disadvantage is that method 1 tends to over emphasize the formal or technical aspect (cell 2) and to a slightly lesser degree, it over emphasizes the overt aspect of power (cell 1). It fails to provide equal emphasis to the covert aspect of power cell 3).

Politicians and bureaucrats are always identified because they are publicly involved in the decision making process. Their actions and views become recorded in the minutes of the meetings, and the press. People outside of government are also identified by this method. These people tend to support the issue in some visible manner. Their actions and attitudes also become recorded by some form of public press (ie. magazines and newspapers).

The second major disadvantage was the lack of availability of certain types of documentation, particularly the more personal, private and revealing documentation. For this study, it was found that private correspondence (ie., personal letters from various people involved in either issue) and Ivor Dent's biography of the Commonwealth Games Getting the Games provided more valuable information than press releases, magazine articles and minutes of meetings. Some of this documentation revealed some of the "off the record" lobbying and private disagreements between different people. Essentially this type of documentation revealed some of the non public side of the decision making process.

This "private" type of documentation revealed some of the covert aspects of power (cell 3). However, due to this method's narrow emphasise on cells 1 and 2, this tool is not considered to be a good tool to use for measuring power and to determine if a power structure exists. This method would be considered useful only if more of the private type of documentation could be obtained. If both the 'private' and 'public' types of documentation can be examined then both the covert and overt aspects of power could be measured.

In summary, the use of documents as a means for identifying powerful people can be very limiting. The type of data which can provide much more insight into an issue is seldom available.

The second method (nominations for power) tends to emphasize those people who are overtly powerful, or those who are perceived to be powerful (cell 1). This method makes some distinction as to the relative power of each individual. Those with the most nominations are considered to be the most powerful. However, one particular conclusion reached stresses that visibility should not be used as an indication of power. Those who are very visible are not always those who have influence over events. This conclusion was reached after the data from method 3 was analyzed. As well, method 2 failed to identify cell type 3 (covert power). Some people were later identified as powerful in a covert manner, but not in an overt manner.

Out of the four methods used in this study only the third method (latent content analysis of interviews) emphasized the covert aspect of power (cell 3). Essentially method 3 revealed three things: 1) people with a low amount of visibility (few nominations) could be very influential in a covert manner, 2) people who are the most visible are not always the most powerful, and, 3) people who may be overtly powerful may also be powerful in a covert manner. One important conclusion which can be drawn from this is that the covert aspect of power is very important and should not be neglected. If it is not incorporated into power studies the results for each study would be biased. Therefore, the covert aspect of power is as important as the overt aspect. It is, however, much harder to measure.

The results obtained by method 4 (projected reputational) emphasized cell type 2 (the ceremonial, formal or technical functions). Cell 2 represents the position of a person rather than the covert or overt use of power. All of the respondents to the question (#7, see interview guide) answered it in the same way. All stressed the importance of the position rather than the name of a person. Although there were some comments made concerning the importance of personal characteristics of people, there were no particular people identified. It was not the support of certain people that was essential, rather, it was the support of people in certain positions that was important for obtaining another major sporting event.

One of the main conclusions drawn from these results from method 4 is that people tend to associate power with position. The personal characteristics of people were not stressed nearly as much as the importance of positions. Upon a comparison of the positions of people from each event a large overlap of similar positions was revealed. The positions which overlapped included the mayor, premier, adlermen, provincial ministers and civic administrators.

In summary, some of the main methodological conclusions drawn from use of these four methods are as follows: 1) different methods identify and emphasize different aspects of power, 2) the two most important aspects of power are the overt and covert (located in cell 1 and cell 3), 3) these two aspects of power were identified by methods 1, 2 and method 3, and 4) if one method of identification is used in a study, a bias in the results will occur, and it is therefore important to incorporate methods which will measure both the overt and covert aspects of power.

Power Structure for Major Sporting Events in Edmonton

Results obtained by methods 1 and 2 do not support the hypothesis that there is an elite power structure responsible for bringing both major sporting events to Edmonton. However, the third method revealed that there was a 41.3% overlap of people from each event. This 41.3% overlap supports the hypothesis. Therefore, it appears that according to one methodology there is a small nucleus of people responsible for bringing both major sporting events to Edmonton.

Due to the covert nature of the contributions of many of the people comprising this group, few people in Edmonton are aware the group exists. As well, few people (including individuals involved in the events) are aware of the importance of some of the individuals in this group. In conclusion, although most Edmontonians do not realize it, there is a covert group of people responsible for obtaining both major sporting events.

In light of the findings from this study (and others) the democratic process is not as straightforward as it might seem. It would appear that the support of a variety of influential people is important in determining the outcome of an issue. This support can occur in a covert manner. It may be possible that a small group of people may be responsible for obtaining major sporting events. Thus, it may be possible that small elite groups are also responsible for other areas in community decision making. It would be interesting to determine if there is any overlap in membership between groups involved in different issue areas.

Results from the fourth method indicate a substantial overlap in the positions held by people in each event.

Although the people holding the positions may have changed, many of the positions themselves have remained the same. For example, the position of the mayor is evident in both events although a different person held the position. The same is true for several aldermanic positions, provincial ministerial positions, the dean of the faculty of physical education and for several civic administration positions. In conclusion, it would seem that by this evidence there are certain positions which are essential to the success of obtaining major sporting events. Without the support of the incumbents in these positions the chances for obtaining major sporting events is greatly reduced.

Utility of Study for the Practitioner

One of the major reasons for doing this study was to devise a means for identifying influential people, or in other words, identifying the important linkages in the decision making process of an organization.

Understanding the linkages in the decision making process of an organization is essential to someone who wants to effect some sort of change in its normal operation. For example, a recreation practitioner may want to change the way funds are allocated to different projects. In order to effect any change that person must first know how to move through the system. The organizational heads (power brokers) must be reached and influenced to make the desired change.

As shown in the study, the people responsible for making the final decision are only a part of the whole decision making process. For example, a power broker such as Myer Herowitz (President of the University of Alberta) depended upon people such as George Poole (Associate Vice President of Finance) and Herb McLachlin (Dean of the Physical Education Faculty). Cec Purves (Mayor of Edmonton) depended upon Ron Hayter (Alderman) and Ron Furgeson (Special Events Co-ordinator for Edmonton). Power brokers (people in the top decision making position) depend upon and act upon advice from a variety of different people. The practitioner would have to work through these linkages to the power broker to make the desired change.

By using the third method of identification (latent content analysis of interviews) the different linkages would be identified. Once identified, they would be contacted on a one to one basis to obtain their support. In turn, through their advice and prompting, the power broker may act according to the wishes originally desired by the practitioner.

It is also important to realize that power brokers will have linkages outside of the organization, which affect his or her decisions. These outside linkages could be identified in the same fashion as mentioned previously.

This method of identification could feasibly be used by practitioners who are hoping to initiate some sort of major project or initiate some sort of major change in the way things are done in the organization (eg., operations, structure, goals or objectives). Once the system of linkages has been identified, it is possible that it could be used again at a latter date. However, some changes will occur over time due to people leaving or changing positions.

Suggestions for Further Research

The methodology used in this study could be applied to a variety of other situations. For example other areas of community decision making could be examined to determine whether there are people responsible for influencing the decision making process for a particular area. Furthermore, the people identified as being influential for different issues in different areas can be compared to determine if any overlap exists.

With regards to Edmonton it would be interesting to examine a variety of issues from the different areas of community decision making. An analysis of the data which would be collected would provide a greater understanding of Edmonton's political decision making process. In the process of the investigation the "movers" and the "shakers" (ie. people who get things done) would be identified. To some extent, the city's influential people will be revealed.

Another use for the methodology would be to identify influential people in sport at the national level. Different events over a ten year period could be examined to determine if there is any overlap of people who are identified as influential for particular events. It would be interesting to know if an elite power structure exists in sport at the national level. If an elite power structure does exist, it would be beneficial to know who is a part of that structure.

This knowledge would be important for people and groups who are soliciting national organizations (federal government, national sports governing bodies and private companies), for financial support.

Lastly, the method could be utilized by researchers in other cities to determine who is influential in sport and for obtaining major sporting events. Different cities could exhibit different degrees of overlap between influential people.

Recommendations for Methodological Approach

The covert aspect of power should be stressed as much as possible and much effort must be directed to measuring it. In light of the findings from this study, covert power is very important and should not be neglected. The method of investigation should be altered somewhat to provide more of a focus for identifying covert power. Three major revisions should be incorporated into the methodology before further use of it is made. They include, the elimination of method 2 (number of nominations), greater pains should be taken to gather personal or private documentation and a greater emphasis on method 3 (analysis of interviews).

A person should not be considered powerful based upon the number of nominations they receive. The number of nominations does not measure overt power but rather determines or measures the extent of a person's visibility. Therefore the method is of no value.

The information gleaned from private letters and closed meetings provides information which identifies covert actions and covert power. Some of the private and personal documents examined for this study revealed information both unknown to the public and information contrary to public belief. These types of documents provide valuable information. They are, unfortunately, hard to obtain. However, more effort should be directed to obtaining these documents. Respondents to the interviews could be asked to provide copies of personal letters and other private documentation.

The third method, content analysis of people's comments, proved to provide much information about people who were powerful in an overt manner and those who were powerful in a covert manner. A greater amount of information could be obtained if respondents are given the opportunity to examine the questionnaire in order to prepare for the interview. Respondents would be given more time to recollect names and occurrences. In addition, they would be able to consult their own personal records.

During the interviews for this study, many respondents could have supplied more information (names and occurrences) had they been given more time. This was stated by some and alluded to by others.

Another improvement which should be made is to increase the time limits for obtaining interviews. One problem with this study was that not all (or even the majority) of the people nominated as powerful were interviewed. This was due to time constraints. Some of the people who were identified as powerful (by method 3) were not interviewed. These people may have been able to provide the information, to which other people already interviewed, were not privy. New names and more information concerning the covert aspects of the issues could have been obtained. Therefore, more time should be allocated for the interview aspect of the methodology.

It would also be advantageous to interview a respondent twice. A respondent may remember details he or she had previously forgotten. More information would be collected this way. In addition, the second interview would provide a good reliability check. The information collected in each interview would be compared to determine the extent of consistency. Reliability would be greater for those interviews which provide fairly consistent responses.

In addition it is important to be aware of the impact of ideology on the method chosen to identify powerful people and the cut off point for deciding with a power structure does exist or not. People looking for an elite will accept a lower overlapping point, whereas pluralists look for a larger overlap. A major problem in this type of research is that there is no definitive cut off point. For example, some studies (Robert E. Agger et. al., 1964, and Delbert C. Miller, 1958) accepted cut off points which were below 30%. If these cut off points were used for this study, then the second method would also have found an elite power structure.

The findings in this study show the problem of ideologies and their affect on the selection of methodology and problem of selecting a cut off point. The cut off point can't be too low so that an elite power structure is sure to be found, nor should it be too high so that an elite power structure will never be found.

This study has shown some of the inherent problems which with researchers are faced with in the study of power structures in the community. More importantly, this study has also shown how all of these problems and innaccurate assumptions about power (as discussed in pages 11 to 23) can be overcome. Due to the elimination of many of these past problems, the findings from this study are closer to reality (i.e., the actual distribution of power and its use in bringing major sporting events to Edmonton). By utilizing the recommendations suggested in this chapter for the methodological approach, the findings of future research will also be closer to reality.

Essentially, this study has achieved the goals which were set down on page 6 in the first chapter. Firstly, the methodology used in this study coupled with the recommendations in this chapter provides a guideline for other researchers in their efforts to discover the distribution of power. Findings in this study were not pre-ordained because of methodological or conceptual bias. Steps were taken to eliminate this bias which has plagued most of the past research.

The first goal can be considered to be theoretically important (i.e., concerns the debate between methodological and conceptual differences), whereas the second goal can be considered to be more practically important. It is very important to identify the people who affect the decision making process in a covert way (e.g., mobilization of bias) in order to hold them accountable for their actions. In other words, people responsible for certain policies which affect community life should be revealed so that they can be held accountable for their actions. In addition, people (such as recreation practitioners) can obtain a clearer understanding of the decision making process and of the different linkages involved.

Studies such as this one are worth doing because it is very important to understand the decision making process and to identify and hold accountable those people who make decisions which affect our lives. Decisions are made which benefit some and harm others. Those people who are harmed by a decision can take an appropriate action to penalize the person who made the decision. For example, they can change their vote during the next election, lobby public officials, write a letter, or even take legal action. People can also reward those who make decisions which benefit them. For example, a politician may receive extra votes at election time, public officials or private officials may get a promotion, or a number of other things.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

AIKEN, Michael and Paul E. Mott., eds. The Structure of Community Power. New York: Random House, 1970.

BACHRACH, Peter and Morton S. BARATZ. Power and Poverty, Theory and Practice. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

BACHRACH, Peter, ed. Political Elites in a Democracy. New York: Atherton Press, 1971.

BANFIELD, Edward C. and Martin MEYERSON. Politics, Planning and the Public Interest. New York: The Free Press of Glascoe, 1955.

BANFIELD, Edward C., ed, Urban Government. rev. ed., New York: The Free Press, 1969

BELL, Roderick et al, eds. Political Power. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

BURGESS, M. Elaine. Negro Leadership in a Southern City. Chapel Hill: N.C., 1960.

BRADBURN, Norman M. and Seymour SUDMAN. Improving Interview Method and Questionnaire Design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980.

CARNEY, Thomas F. Content Analysis. Winnipeg, University of Manitoba Press, 1972.

CARTWRIGHT, Dorwin. "Influence, Leadership and Control". in Roderick Bell et al., eds. Political Power. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

DAHL, Robert. Who Governs? New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

DAHL, Robert. Modern Political Analysis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall, 1963

DAHL, Robert. "Who Governs?" in W.D. Hawley and F. Wirt. The Search For Community Power. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1974

DENT, Ivor. Getting The Games. Edmonton: Ardent Enterprises, 1977.

DOMHOFF, G. William. Who Rules America. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

FIELD, Arthur J. Urban Power Structure. New York: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1970.

FORCESE, Dennis. "Elites and Power in Canada" in John Redekop ed. Approaches to Canadian Politics. Prentice-Hall of Canada Ltd., 1978.

FREEMAN, Linton C. Patterns of Local Community Leadership. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company Inc. 1968.

FRENCH, John and Bertram RAVEN. "The Bases of Social Power in Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Group Dynamics. New York: Harpers and Row Publishers, 1968.

GUTMAN, Robert and David POPENOE, eds. Neighborhoods, City and Metropolis. New York: Random House, 1970.

HAWLEY, W.D. and F. WIRT, eds. The Search for Community Power. rev. ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1974.

HAYES, Edward C. Power Structure and Urban Policy. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.

HUNTER, Floyd. Community Power Structure.Chapel Hill: Universiy of Northern Carolina Press, 1953.

JENNINGS, M. Kent. Community Influencials. The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

KEYNES, Edward and David M. RICCI, eds. Political Power, Commmunity and Democracy. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1970.

LASWELL, H.D. and A. KAPLAN. Power and Society. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

LUKES, Stephen. Power, A Radical View. The Macmillan Press, 1974.

LYND, Robert S. and Helen M. LYND. Middletown. Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., 1929.

MILLS, C. Wright. Power, Politics and People. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.

NAGEL, Jack H. The Descriptive Analysis of Power. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1975

PARRY, Geraint. Political Elites. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1969.

POLSBY, Nelson W. Community Power and Political Theory. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.

PRESTHUS, Robert. Men at the Top. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

ROSE, Arnold M. The Power Structure. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

SAYRE, Wallace S. and Herbert KAUFMAN. Governing New York City. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1960.

SCOBLE, Henry. "Leadership Hierarchies and Political Issues in a New England Town." in Morris Janowitz ed. Community Political Systems. Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

SCHULZE, Robert O. "The Bifuracation of Power in a Satelite City." in Morris Janowitz ed. Community Political Systems. Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

WEBER, Max. "Class, Status and Party". in W.D. Hawley and F. Wirt. The Search for Community Power. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.

ARTICLES

ABU-LABAN, Baha. "The Reputational Approach in the Study of Community Power". Pacific Sociological Review, (Spring, 1965).

ANTON, Thomas J. "Power Pluralism and Local Politics". Administrative Science Quarterly, (March 1963).

BACHRACH, Peter and M.S. BARATZ. "Decisions and Non-decisions. An Analytical Framework", American Political Science Review, 57, (September, 1963) 641-651.

BIERSTEDT, Robert. "An Analysis of Social Power". American Sociological Review, 15, 6 (December, 1950). 730-738.

CONWAY, William J. "Economic Dominants and Community Power. A Reputational and Decisional Analysis". The American Journal of Economics and Sociology. 32,2 (July 1973) 269-282.

DAHL, Robert. "The Concept of Power". Behavioral Science, 2 (July 1957), 201-214.

DANYGER, M. Herbert. "Community Power Structure: Problems and Continuities". American Sociological Review. 29 (October, 1964), 707-717.

DICK, Harry R. "A Method for Ranking Community Influencials". American Sociological Review. 25 (June 1960), 395-399.

FORM, William H. and W.D. D'Antonio. "Integration and Clevage among Community Influencials in Two Border Cities". American Sociological Review, 24 (November, 1959), 804-814.

FOX, Douglas M. "The Identification of Community Leaders by the Reputational and Decisional Methods: Three Case Studies and an Empirical Analysis of the Literature". Sociology and Social Research, 54,1 (October, 1969), 94-103.

FREEMAN, Linton C. et al. "Locating Leaders in Local Communities: A Comparison of Some Alternative Approaches". American Sociological Review, 28 (October, 1963), 791-798.

FRENCH, Robert Mills and Michael AIKEN. "Community Power in Cornucopia: A Replication in a Small Community of the Bonjean Technique of Identifying Community Leaders". The Sociological Quarterly, 9,2 (Spring, 1968), 261-270.

GOLDHAMMER, H. and E. SHILS. "Types of Power and Status". American Journal of Sociology, 54, 2, (September, 1939), 171-182.

MAGILL, R.S. and J.N. CLARK. "Community Power and Decision Making, Recent Research and Its Policy Implications". Social Service Review, 49, 1 (March 1975), 33-46.

MARCH, James G. "An Introduction to the Theory and Measurement of Influence". American Political Science Review, 49 (June, 1955), 431-451.

PEABODY, Robert L. "Perceptions of Organizational Authority: A Comparative Analysis." Administrative Science Quarterly, 6, (March, 1962).

POLSBY, Nelson W. "How to Study Community Power: The Pluralist Alternative". Journal of Politics, 22 (1960), 478-484.

ROSSI, Peter H. "Power and Community Structures". Midwest Journal of Political Science, 4 (November, 1960), 390-401.

SIMON, Herbert A. "Notes on the Observation and Measurement of Power". Journal of Politics, 15 (November, 1953), 500-516.

SMART, Don and John HIGLEY. "Why Not Ask Them? Interviewing Australian Elites About National Power Structure". The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 13, 3, (October, 1977), 248-253.

WOLFINGER, Raymond E. "Reputatin and Reality in the Study of Community Power". American Sociological Review, 25 (October, 1960) 636-644.

DISSERTATIONS

MACLEOD, Allan Ross. "Students Union Power and Influence Structure". Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1971.

ST. JAMES, Alice Margaret. "An Investigation of Participation by Community Groups in the Decision Making Process in Elected, Partly Elected and Appointed School Boards". Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1966.

VINTON, Dennis Allan. "The Relationship Between Power Structure and Parks and Recreation in a Large Urban Community". Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1969.

THESIS

BINNS, Patrick George. "Community Power as an Element of Social Action". Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1972.

PHILLETT, Serena. "An Analysis of Community Influence: Some Conceptual and Methodological Considerations". Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1964.

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

Edmonton Journal January 1, 1969 to December 17, 1976 (Commonwealth Games).

Edmonton Journal February 1977 to December 1982 (University Games).

APPENDICES I, II, & III has been removed due to poor print quality of the material.

These included pages 145 - 153 as listed in the table of contentc.